NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment-----Without Compromise.

VOLUME V.—NO. 48. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1845. WHOLE NUMBER 256.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
At 142, Nassau Street, New-York.

Sydney Howard Gay,
Maria Weston Chapman,
Edmund Quincy,
} Editors.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY.

Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. GAY, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—$2 00 a year, in advance; $2 50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10 00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies, for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1 50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post-Office Department: "A postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Pro-Slavery.

From the Conservative.

"THE BROTHERHOOD OF THIEVES."

Most of our readers have no doubt heard of *Stephen S. Foster*, the celebrated abolition lecturer, and of his book, entitled, "*The Brotherhood of Thieves;* or a True Picture of the American Church and Clergy." In this work, the pious reformer takes the ground that the churches of the land are dens of thieves and robbers, and that the ministry are a race of desperadoes and cut-throats. Of the Methodist Episcopal Church he says:

"Is not this church, then, a "Brotherhood of Thieves?" Is it not, rather a *conclave of incarnate fiends*, whose influence is as much more corrupting to the morals of the community than the theatre, as its doctrines are more *damnable?* For one, much as I deprecate the erection of a theatre, I deprecate the erection of a Methodist meeting-house *more!* The stage does not teach my neighbors that the New Testament allows them to enslave my wife and children; but the Methodist pulpit *does!* I know not in what light others view this subject; for myself, I regard every *intelligent* communicant in the Methodist church as more guilty and infamous in the sight of God, than the common prostitute, the pickpocket, or the assassin; and I cannot associate with him on any other terms of intercourse, than those which I stipulate for those infamous characters."

Such are the doctrines, the language, and the spirit, of the great reformers of the age. For we are not to suppose Mr. Foster is heterodox with his brethren, or that he stands alone in his denunciations. No, no. He is fully sustained by the great body of the Abolition fraternity. The "*Anti-Slavery Standard*," the organ of the "American Anti-Slavery Society," fully endorses for Mr. Foster. In the number for March 20th, the editor heads an article "The Brotherhood of Thieves," in which he alludes to Mr. Foster's position, and says: "With the exception of the Covenanters, and here and there an individual church of other denominations, *this is the character of the American Church!*"

But the reader may ask, "Where are the True Wesleyans? Are they not an exception also?" Not in the judgment of the genuine Abolitionists—the simon pures of the order; for the editor adds:

"I wish the Wesleyan Methodists might be added also, but until they disprove the charge against them, that Christian character in the old church will give admission to the new, and prove also that a consistent anti-slavery life must be shown before admission can be given, they must be reckoned in the same category."

So it goes. The "Wesleyans" denounce other churches as "corrupt, polluted, and blood-stained," for lack of the purifying influence of abolitionism; and the organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society ranks the "Wesleyans" in "*the same category*" with "*thieves*," "*pickpockets*," "*prostitutes*," and "*incarnate fiends*," for the same reason!

"Who shall decide when *Doctors* disagree,"
When *Quincy, Gay, and Chapman* war with Lee!!

But we discover in the very next column of the "Standard," from which the above quotation is made, an editorial that may throw some light upon the character of the Abolition "Brotherhood." As it is short, we give it entire:

"THE" HERALD OF FREEDOM.

"The first number of a new paper with this purloined name has been issued. It is published at Concord, New Hampshire, "by its friends": John R. French, publishing agent: N. P. Rogers, Editor. I am indebted to a friend for a sight of the felonious sheet, as the publisher was too much ashamed, for his own sake, to send it to me, or had too much consideration left for me to inflict a gratuitous insult. I am glad that thus much chance is left for charity to believe that the sense of shame has not altogether fled. The paper is announced in one corner to be the 481st No. of the 10th Vol.; and in the other to be the 1st No. of the 1st Vol. of a new series. The OLD Herald has reached the 491st No. of its 10th Vol.

I regret for the sake of the cause to record so contemptible an act as this, committed by men who have heretofore won for themselves a place in the love and esteem of Abolitionists. The bold theft of the Emancipator was honorable compared with this petty larceny. I hope and believe that it will receive but little countenance.—G."

This is from Mr. Gay, one of the male editors of the "Standard." Now, on the showing of this gentleman, it appears,

1st. That one Abolition paper has a "*purloined*." i. e. a "*stolen*" *name*.—See *Webster*.

2d. That the paper is a "felonious," i. e. a "depraved," "malicious, villainous, traitorous," and "perfidious" sheet.

3d. That this "contemptible act," (i. e. the stealing of a periodical, list, press, office, and fixtures,) was "committed by men who have heretofore won for themselves a place in the love and esteem of the Abolitionists." They were of the genuine "Brotherhood."

4th. That the conductors of this paper are guilty of "petty larceny," i. e. "*theft*," or "the act of taking and carrying away the goods of another feloniously"—a States Prison offence!

5th. That this is no new thing with the Abolitionists, but that the "Emancipator," also, was *boldly stolen* by its present proprietors!!

Here, then, we have it. Two Abolitionist periodicals "STOLEN!!" the one a "*bold theft*," and the other a transaction, compared with which, bold theft is "*honorable!!!*" And yet these men presume to arraign nearly all the churches and ministers in the land as "A BROTHERHOOD OF THIEVES!!" "Thou hypocrite! First cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

The new editor of the Christian Register, the organ of the Unitarians at Boston, thus gives in his allegiance to Slavery, by the abuse of all who are doing anything for its removal.

SLAVERY.

The Christian Watchman of last week contained what appears to be the conclusion of a discussion that has been going on for some time, on the subject of Slavery, between two eminent clergymen of the Baptist denomination. Dr. Wayland, who closed the debate, is universally known as the President of Brown University, and a writer whose celebrity is not confined to his own country. His opponent, who has defended the Southern side of the question, is Richard Fuller, D. D. of South Carolina. Dr. Fuller is a graduate of Harvard College, of the class of 1824. He was highly distinguished for talents and learning while at college, and has early risen to the highest rank for eloquence and influence in a sect which is one of the largest in the United States, and includes many eminent men among its scholars and divines.

The discussion has been marked with the most signal ability, eloquence, and comprehensiveness of views, on both sides. It has developed the difficulties that belong to the question, and at the same time has reduced, and opened the way for the removal of, them.

On some points the writers have come to an agreement, and such is the good spirit and good sense, in which they have conducted the discussion, that their readers and the parties whom they represent, will undoubtedly sustain them on all points in which they have agreed. The field of conflict is thus narrowed, and an approach made towards a final solution of this most vexed and most fearful question, by the mild and peaceful, but irresistible, energies of reason, charity, good sense, an enlightened conscience, and Christian affections.

We have never sympathized in the violent expressions, and impassioned tone, in which many good men among us have treated this subject. We believe that the evil of Slavery is not too great for Christian men to grapple with; that, vast and wide spread, and deep-rooted as it appears to be, it will melt and vanish away before the Christian light and philanthropy of this and the coming ages. We believe, however, that it cannot be reduced by violent invectives, by potent combinations, or by political enginery, but that in a conflict with them, it will continue to obtain an advantage.

Our confidence is in calm, rational, kind, and respectful discussion, addressed only to the better judgment and better feelings of men. The magnitude of the evil, and the violence of sensibility with which it is defended by those implicated in it, only render it more indispensably necessary to move against it in the armor, and wielding the weapons, of Christian gentleness, charity, and love.

We believe that this discussion between Drs. Wayland and Fuller has done more to promote the amelioration and removal of Slavery than all the passionate appeals and efforts to create excitement, and bring the machinery of political power to bear against it, which have been made. Those persons in the South, who respond to the expression of Dr. Fuller, regard the subject with less heat and obstinacy of prejudice than they did before, while Dr. Wayland has set us an example, and shown us the importance, of appreciating the difficulties that press upon the practical adjustment of the question. A spirit of mutual respect, *without which it is absolutely impossible to communicate truth or exert a moral influence*, has been recommended and imparted to both sides, and our confidence is great that this will lead to still further discussion, in a similar spirit and by men of similar eminence and ability in the several sects, and that at last all Christians, of every name, will be found united, in promoting the peaceful and wisely-conducted removal of the greatest evil that now oppresses and endangers the interests of humanity.

Selections.

IMPORTANT DEBATE ON OREGON

HOUSE OF LORDS, April 4th—Midnight.—Lord Clarendon, in the House of Lords, introduced the subject of the Oregon territory, in order to elicit from the Government some information as to our relations with the United States upon this question, and the course it was intended to pursue in case Congress, acting upon the expressed opinion of the President, should proceed to take possession of the country, or to annex it to the United States. His Lordship, after briefly noticing the conduct of America towards Texas, and the extraordinary terms in which Mr. Polk had declared the unequivocal right of the United States to the whole territory, temperately reviewed the grounds on which the British claims are founded, and concluded by expressing his anxious hope, that while whatever could be justly claimed should be readily conceded, the Government would not shrink from vindicating, if necessary the nation's honor, or upholding her interests.

The Earl of Aberdeen—I think it is perfectly natural that in such a conjuncture as the present, the noble Lord may reasonably expect to receive such information from her Majesty's Government as they, in the discharge of their duty, may feel it possible to give. I am far from objecting to the course of putting questions to the Government upon any matter of public importance, and certainly not on one of such paramount interest as this. My Lords, if I followed my own inclination in this matter, I should at once be disposed to lay on the table of the House every part of the negotiation which has taken place upon this subject, from the period of the treaty of Washington up to the present day. I am sure that if I did so I should not only receive from the candor of my noble friend opposite an opinion approving the course which has been pursued, but might fairly appeal to the public at large, and even to the whole of Europe for its confirmation. A time may come when such a course may possibly be necessary. At present it would clearly be unsuitable and impolitic. I could wish for an opportunity to explain a little more at length the state of this question, as affects the interest and the claim of this country to the disputed territory. The noble Lord has cursorily described the claims of this country and of the United States with sufficient accuracy, as far as he has gone. They, however, would admit of a much more detailed examination, and, although I might now enter into that examination without injury to the public service, I feel that I could not do it without inconvenience to your lordships, and this also I think it better to defer to a future occasion. I shall, therefore, only address myself to the inquiry of my noble friend. I wish to state that the negotiation which has taken place, and which is still pending upon this subject, was commenced immediately after the signing of the treaty by my noble friend near me. Without, of course, explaining to your lordships any of the steps that have been taken in the progress of that negotiation, I wish to draw your attention to the last act of the late President before his resignation from office. The Senate of the United States having addressed Mr. Tyler so long ago as the month of December, requesting him to communicate with them and inform them as to the progress of this negotiation, Mr. Tyler, in his answer, which was not delivered until the 19th of February, states—"In my opinion, as this negotiation is still pending, the information sought for cannot be communicated without prejudice to the public service, but I deem it proper to add, that considerable progress has been made in the negotiation, which has been carried on in a very amicable spirit between the two Governments, and that there is reason to hope that it may be brought to a close within a short period. I have delayed answering the resolution of the Senate, under the expectation expressed in my annual message, that the negotiation would be terminated before the close of the present session, and that the information called for by that resolution might be communicated." I am bound to say that I think the late President took somewhat too favorable a view of the state of the negotiation when he made that answer to the Senate. At the same time, as an indication of a friendly feeling, and of a desire to bring it to an amicable termination, such a declaration of opinion must be highly satisfactory. My Lords, in a fortnight after the delivery of this answer to the address of the Senate, the new President made the inaugural speech referred to by my noble friend. I wish to observe that this speech is not an address made to Congress—it is a speech made to the public. The Congress not being sitting, no speech of the kind could be made by the President of the United States without drawing towards it the most serious attention. Nevertheless, it does not possess the importance of an official document, nor can it be regarded as forming part of legislative proceedings. I do not undervalue its appearance; but I must observe, that it has not quite the character of an address made to the Congress as the foundation of any legislative measure. I have already mentioned that that declaration of the late President is the last act of which we have any knowledge as far the negotiation is concerned. The new President had no ministry at the time he made his speech. His administration was not formed, and no communication had taken place between her Majesty's Ministers and any Government of the United States since the resignation of the late President and of his administration. We therefore stand precisely in the position in which we stood at the time of the answer of the late President, with the exception of such a character as the relation may have received from the speech pronounced upon his inauguration by the new President. My Lords, I wish also to state, that our position is precisely such as it has been for the last eighteen years, with respect to our rights, and the treaty which was made in 1827, renewing or rather continuing the treaty of 1818, which was for ten years. The treaty of 1827 continued that treaty for an indefinite period, but with the provision that either party might terminate it by a year's notice. There is nothing whatever to prevent the Government of the United States or her Majesty's Government, if they thought proper, from terminating that treaty of 1827 by giving a year's notice for the purpose, which, however, the President has not said he means to give; but if he does mean it, he cannot effect his purpose without a vote of the Congress authorizing him to do so; the Congress will not meet unless specially called together until the month of December, and even then the treaty cannot expire without a year's notice being given from the time at which the President receives the necessary authority to give such notice. Your Lordships will see, therefore, that in point of time, the matter is not so urgent as might be supposed. I need not say that her Majesty's Government will continue to avail themselves of the intervening period which may exist in the hope of bringing the negotiations, which are still pending, to an amicable conclusion. The negotiation was founded upon the principle of an amicable adjustment by the mutual concession of extreme claim on both sides, and on that principle it will be continued. My noble friend has by no means expressed any censure of the mode of proceeding that her Majesty's Government have adopted in this matter; at the same time, I have seen in other places some intimation, some apprehension of too great concessions of a total abandonment of what is called "the high tone;" although, I am accustomed almost daily to see myself characterized as pusillanimous, cowardly, mean, dastardly, truckling, base—(A laugh)—I hope I need not say that I view these appellations with indifference; I view them, indeed, really with satisfaction; because I know perfectly well what they mean, and how they ought to be and really are translated. I feel perfectly satisfied that these vituperative terms are translated as applicable to conduct consistent with justice, reason, moderation, and with common sense, and I therefore feel, as I said before, really not indifferent, but positively satisfied, when I see such observations. (Loud cheers.) I believe I may conscientiously say that no man ever filled the high situation which I have the honor unworthily to hold, who felt more ardently desirous than I do to preserve to the country the blessings of peace, or who would be disposed to make greater sacrifices to maintain it. My Lords, I consider war to be the greatest folly, if not the greatest crime of which a country could be guilty, if lightly entered into; and I agree with an honorable writer who said if a proof were wanted of the deep and thorough corruption of human nature, we should find it in the fact that war itself was sometimes lawful. (Cheers.) It is the duty, and I am sure it is the inclination, of her Majesty's Government to preserve peace; at the same time there are limits which must not be passed; and I say that without attaching too much weight to questions of honor, for I think, fortunately for this country, that we need not be very sensitive on these matters—it is not for us, God knows, to seek the "bubble reputation at the cannon's mouth" or anywhere else; our power, our character and position are such as to enable us to look with indifference on that of which other countries might be perhaps more jealous—but our honor is substantially properly that we can certainly never neglect and most assuredly we may owe to ourselves and to our posterity to adopt a course contrary to all our desires—to all our inclinations. My Lords, from what I have said, your lordships will perceive an earnest of the spirit of peace, which shall pervade this matter, if I continue to conduct this negotiation; and I cannot bring myself to think that at this day any civilized Government would desire to see any other course pursued; and I hope, therefore, and fully believe that we shall have the happiness of seeing this important question brought to a satisfactory and amicable conclusion. (Loud cheers.) Should it be otherwise, I can only say that we possess rights which, in our opinion, are clear and unquestionable, and, by the blessing of God, and with your support, those rights we are fully prepared to maintain. The noble Earl resumed his seat amidst loud and general applause.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, APRIL 4, MIDNIGHT.—In the House of Commons, Lord J. Russell, on reading the order of the day for going into Committee of supply, called the attention of the House to that part of the message of the President of the United States which related to the territory of Oregon. It was not his intention, he said, to enter at all into the question of the foreign policy of her Majesty's Government, or even of their policy on this very subject of the Oregon, neither was it his wish, by any observations which he might then make, to embarrass their proceedings. But the inaugural address of President Polk had taken this question out of the ordinary course of diplomatic arrangement, and required some notice on the part of members of that House. That distinguished functionary had adopted a course entirely new, which, if it were not met by something unusual on their parts, would let questions of great national importance be decided hereafter by popular addresses from the head of the Government, and by the popular action resulting therefrom. The President in his message had alluded to the Annexation of Texas to the United States, an allusion which he only noticed for the purpose of showing that the present policy of the executive Government of the United States tended to territorial aggrandizement. In his next sentence the President declared his intention to assert and maintain by all constitutional means, the right of the United States to that portion of their territory which was situate beyond the Rocky Mountains. "Our title," said he, "to the country of Oregon is clear and unquestionable, and already are our people preparing to perfect that title by occupying it with their wives and children." In consequence of this declaration, he (Lord J. Russell) felt compelled to call the attention of the House and the country to this question, in order that they might see how far the President was justified in saying that his title to the country of the Oregon was clear and unquestionable, and in declaring his intention to take it into his possession without any regard to those treaties, which were generally the bonds of peace between independent nations. There were three modes by which a title might be acquired to a country like the Oregon:—the first was by the ancient discovery; the second by treaty; and the third by discovery ancient or modern, followed up by occupation and settlement. He then entered into a statement of considerable length, for the purpose of showing that if the title to the Oregon rested on ancient discovery, England could put in a claim far superior to that of the United States; that if it rested on treaty, we had a claim that was undeniable, whilst that of the United States had no ground whatever to stand on; and that if it rested on modern discovery, the discovery of the Columbia, made, carried on, and authorized by regular officers of the British Government, and the subsequent settlement of the territory surrounding it by British subjects, gave us a title which the American Government could not displace. Captain Vancouvre had discovered the river Columbia; his lieutenant had sailed ninety miles up its stream, and British subjects from Canada, had erected eighteen forts on its banks, and had long carried on a favorable trade there. He then gave a history of the negotiations between Great Britain and the United States respecting this country, and traced them from the commencement to the period when the existing convention was formed in 1827, between Mr. Rush on the one side, and Mr. Huskisson on the other. A new circumstance had now risen up. The President of the United States had made a peremptory claim to all this territory, and had called upon the citizens of the United States to go forth with their wives and children to take possession of it. Now, Columbia was become of more importance each succeeding year. The Government ought, therefore, to insist on a speedy solution of this question; for there was danger lest the citizens of the United States should disturb British subjects in the enjoyment of their property on the Oregon, and should thus produce a collision between the two Governments. He was not prepared to say that Great Britain should abate any of her just pretensions, nor where we should draw the line between the Americans and ourselves. He thought, however, that we could not accede to a proposal less than that made by Mr. Canning, in 1827, with any regard to our own interests. He had heard it said that the value of this territory was a matter of indifference to us; but it was not a matter of indifference to us whether we should yield any portion of our territory to what he must be permitted to call a blustering announcement. It was not a matter of indifference to us, that the means of communication between Columbia on the one hand, and our possessions in India and China on the other, should be surrendered to a foreign power. It was not a matter of indifference to us that the tone and character of England should be lowered in any transaction which we carried on with the United States. He should have abstained from entering into this question if it had been left as a diplomatic question between the Earl of Aberdeen and Mr. Buchanan, as the agents of the British and American Governments; but as it had been taken out of their hands, he could do what the Minister of the Crown was precluded by his position from doing—he could state to the people of England what were their rights. Having made that statement, he should leave the whole matter in the hands of the Government, and he had no doubt that they would consult the interests of the country and the honor of the Crown.

Sir R. Peel could not be surprised, and should not feel regret, that the noble Lord had taken the course which he had pursued. He was of opinion that, whilst these matters were pending in negotiations between the two Governments, it was politic to abstain from exercising the right of discussion on subjects calculated to excite popular feeling, unless there were cogent reasons to the contrary. If the noble Lord had thought it right to depart from that course on this occasion, he ought not to be held responsible for the consequences; for it appeared that this question had been withdrawn from the cognizance of those to whom it had been entrusted, and that a popular appeal had been made to the passions of the people of the United States by those who ought to have discountenanced such an appeal. The noble Lord had said, that a Minister of the Crown spoke on such a question as the present under the responsibility to which he (Lord J. Russell) was not liable. That was undoubtedly true, and he should therefore abstain from following the noble Lord throughout his statement, as he could not do so without implying opinions from the expression of which he ought to abstain. He felt, however, that it was open to him to inform the House of the general state of our negotiations with the United States on this question. In the year 1818 the northern boundary of the possessions of the United States and of Great Britain, westward to the Rocky Mountains, was defined. No agreement was made as to the country beyond the Rocky Mountains; but a convention signed between the two Governments in 1818, which was to continue for ten years, gave a right of joint occupation to the subjects of each country. In 1824, and again in 1826, Mr. Canning made several attempts to come to an amicable adjustment of our respective claims with the American Government. Those attempts entirely failed. At the end of ten years the convention expired. A new convention was framed in 1827, which continued in force for ten years the convention of 1818, with this proviso, that the convention of 1827 should not necessarily determine by the lapse of time, but should extend beyond the term of ten years, and should terminate after a year's notice from either party, when the rights of both should revive. That was the convention which now affected the territory of the Oregon. Mr. Pakenham, our Minister, had been directed in 1842 to form an amicable arrangement of the claims of the two countries on equitable terms. He read a message of President Tyler, dated the 3d of December, 1843, for the purpose of showing that he had expressed an equal desire to come to an amicable arrangement. Nay, more, on the 19th of February, 1845, about a fortnight before this inaugural address was delivered by President Polk, President Tyler, in reply to an address from the Senate of the United States asking for information relative to the negotiations pending on this question with England, observed—"I have only to say that, as the negotiations are still pending, this information cannot be given. Considerable progress has been made in the negotiations, which have been carried on in an amicable spirit between the two countries, and I hope that it will be speedily brought to an amicable termination." He (Sir Robert Peel) could confirm the language of President Tyler respecting the amiable spirit in which the negotiations had been carried on; but he could not confirm his statement as to the progress of the negotiations, and to his hopes of an amicable termination. On the 5th of March, 1845, Mr. Polk made his inaugural address as President. Since that time we have received no communication from our minister, who had only been able to communicate the message, but had not had time to make any comment on it. The Government of President Polk had been very recently appointed, and no diplomatic communication, as far as he was informed, had taken place with it. He thought it highly probable that Mr. Pakenham would have continued with the present Government the negotiations which he had commenced with the last; but he had no information on the subject. He trusted that the negotiations would be renewed. At no very distant period they would know the result of them. He did not despair of their favorable termination, but if the proposals of the British Government should be rejected, and no proposals were made by the Government of the United States to which we could accede, he should not object, on the part of the Government, to lay on the table all the communications between the two Governments. He still hoped that an amicable and equitable adjustment of the claims of the two countries might be made. He must, however, express his deep regret that, while the negotiations were still pending, the President of the United States, should, contrary to all usages, have referred to other contingencies than a friendly termination of them. Such an allusion was not likely to lead to such a result as the friends to the real interests of both countries desired. He regretted not only the allusion, but also the tone and temper in which it was made. As the subject had been brought under discussion, he felt it to be his duty, on the part of the Government, to state, in language the most temperate, but at the same time the most decisive, that they considered that we have a right to this territory of Oregon, which is clear and unquestionable; that we desire an amicable adjustment of the differences between ourselves and the United States; but that, having exhausted every effort to obtain it, if our rights are invaded, we are resolved and prepared to maintain them.

A tremendous burst of cheers from all parts of the house followed this announciation.

In consequence of an intimation which Sir R. Peel gave at the termination of his speech, that it might be expedient for the House not to express any further opinion at present on this subject, the subject dropped, after a declaration from Lord J. Russell that he would not submit any motion on this subject to the House until all the papers connected with it were laid on the table by her Majesty's Government.

Lord Palmerston then made a short explanation and defence of the observations which he had made on a former evening, respecting the Ashburton "capitulation," and replied to the speech made in behalf of it by Lord Ashburton in the House of Lords.

From the London Times, April 5.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

The American packet, the Caledonia, which has been detained till this morning, will carry out the distinct and emphatic declaration of the British Government on the subject of the Oregon territory, which was received last night with the strong and unanimous satisfaction of both houses of Parliament. When the interests and dignity of the country, and the preservation of the dominions of the Crown, are really at stake, there is no equivocation in the language of the Government to foreign powers, and no semblance of weakness or hesitation in any political party. Lord Palmerston may abuse Lord Ashburton for acceding to the very same conditions which he had himself not only accepted, but urged upon the Cabinet of Washington; and Lord John Russell may boast, that his last official act was to sanction the rejection of a proposal in a negotiation, which turns out to have been but a mere provisional arrangement; but these attempts to depreciate the satisfactory adjustment of a former dispute, which the whigs had been unable to settle in ten years of negotiation, are only proofs that the tricks of party have no effect whatever, on the honest convictions of the country. We are justly proud that on the Oregon question, as well as on that of the Northeastern Boundary, the British Government has uniformly shown its moderation as well as its firmness on our side. It is impossible not to deplore, on the other hand, that ill-regulated, overbearing, and aggressive spirit of the American democracy, which overlooks the real present interest of the two nations in the Oregon territory—that, namely, of letting it alone for another half a century at least, or deciding the matter by arbitration, before any local national interests have sprung up there too powerful to be so disposed of. But, since the Americans, and even the President of the United States, are determined that the question shall not be allowed to rest any longer—since they have rejected the proposal of an arbitration, and ostentatiously announce claims and measures utterly inconsistent with the system of joint occupation, or the equitable recognition of any concurrent rights at all, it is fit that they be warned in the most explicit manner, that their pretensions amount, if acted upon, to the clearest *casus belli* which has ever yet arisen between Great Britain and the American Union. In this case the strong determination and convictions which were expressed last night, are not those of particular statesmen, or of the present Ministers, but of the British Parliament, and of the country. If the question was to be determined by the arguments, and in such discussions—that is to say, by a reference to geographical facts, to discoveries, to history to treaties, and to occupation—the case on behalf of the British claim, as it was ably stated by Lord John Russell, is complete; and it is only in consequence of admissions made with too much laxity on some former occasions—especially in the interpretation of the treaty of Ghent—that any concurrent right can be admitted to exist in the United States to any portion of the territory. But from the character of the recent foreign policy of the Americans and the extraordinary declarations of Mr. Polk, it is evident that no argument will produce any effect; and we can scarcely anticipate that a Government so constituted and directed, will even take a dispassionate or correct survey of the frightful and inevitable consequences of its extravagant references of diplomatic questions to popular clamor. According to all ordinary political calculations, and assuming that Mr. Polk's inaugural address was the manifesto of a Government, and not mere declamation for the hustings, the President already finds himself and the Union placed in presence of two wars, for the avowed purpose of territorial aggrandizement, and in direct violation of the whole policy of America, from Gen. Washington to Mr. Webster. The one with Mexico is so imminent, that we are awaiting with anxiety the next arrivals from that country; the other with Great Britain is more remote, but also more inevitable, if the menaces of the Americans are anything but mere vaporing and bluster. Under these circumstances, a statesman of ordinary caution would direct the public attention, not only to the passions and objects which are likely to cause these wanton and wicked contests, but to the consequences which must attend them. The United States Government is very apt to provoke quarrels, but it is very ill prepared to carry them on. The same democratic folly which makes them arrogant in the Cabinet, makes them habitually feeble in all that constitutes a nation's strength in the field. In a military point of view the consequences of a declaration of war by the Government of Mexico against the United States, would probably be contemptible and indecisive; for neither of the belligerents possess an army at all proportioned to the vast extent of the operations necessary to accomplish any practical result. But if the actual contest on land would probably degenerate into something little better than the partisan warfare of the States of South America, it is not less certain that the *state of war* between the two countries, and the exercise of belligerent rights, would be attended with most serious consequences, not only to themselves, but to neutrals all over the world. The system of letters of marque, which the Americans themselves made no small use of in their last war with Great Britain, places the whole commerce of the United States, undefended as it is by any considerable naval forces, at the mercy of the privateers and adventurers of all nations; and in a war entirely provoked by American rapacity and violence, no usages which have ever been justified by the laws of nations, and by the example of the United States, could be regarded as unwarrantable. The Mexican territory commands both oceans, and the position of the port of Acapulco on the Pacific, would facilitate the most extensive operations against the whole Asiatic trade of the United States and their South Sea whale fisheries. Such a war would be inglorious, and repugnant to the interests of civilization; but it would be worthy of the nefarious transactions in which it had originated, and if Mexico has been plundered of a province by her powerful neighbor, the practices of war would amply justify her in making reprisals wherever she can find them. Letters of marque reflect no honor, and are of no great advantage to a power which may be duly represented on the seas by its own cruisers; but they tend to remove the maratime disparity which exists between two States like Mexico and the Union, and they are not an improper weapon in the hands of the weak for retaliation on the aggressions of the strong.

It is extraordinary that the United States should have advanced so near the brink of war as to have carried through the Senate a measure for annexing Texas, and failed by only two votes in a measure for seizing Oregon, without having taken any perceptible care to provide for the means of consummating such unparalleled acts, of defending themselves from the consequences of them. Are they not aware that in proportion as they assume the illegal exercise of sovereign rights on the desert shores of the Pacific, they expose the populous coasts of the Atlantic to the broadsides and blockade of British fleets? Have they forgotten, in their anxiety to extend their "domestic institutions" to the whole continent of America, that in the event of war they will have to encounter the most novel of all dangers—that arising from the presence of the standard of freedom among a population of slaves? Or is their blindness and infatuation in proportion to the injustice and criminality of their designs, so that, in their eagerness to seize adjacent territories, they overlook the resources of their opponents and their own weakness? The consequences of such a war will prove incalculably disastrous. They would make brave men hesitate, even in a just cause; but the boldness of democracies despises alike the justice of the cause, and the terrible evils of the probable result. We have no intention of aggravating the very serious difficulties with which the indiscreet language of Mr. Polk has already surrounded the Oregon question, and which render a speedy solution of it indispensable to the maintenence of pacific relations between the two nations. The language of this country in such an emergency, and in presence of such opponents, cannot be too temperate or too decided. That language has been used, and with equal propriety and patriotism, by the leaders of each of our great parties. The rights of Great Britain are as clear and unquestionable as those which Mr. Polk has thought fit to make the subject of his inaugural address; and whatever he may be prepared to do, this country is, as the Prime Minister of the Crown declared last night, amidst the hearty acclamations of Parliament, "resolved and prepared to maintain them."

From the Antigua Observer.

FAVORABLE FROM ANTIGUA.

We believe it may be asserted with truth, that not more than one-third of those who, during Slavery, were employed in the field labor of estates, are now continuously occupied in that work; or it may be more correct to say, that not more than one-third of the amount of manual labor which was formerly dedicated to the growth and manufacture of our staples is so engaged now. We have been told so by persons competent to judge, and from our own observations we are convinced of it. A great many have withdrawn from sugar cultivation altogether; the boys and girls who used to form the weeding and grass gangs of an estate are no longer there; many work only occasionally as jobbers, when their own independent settlements do not require their presence; others confine their labors to three or four days in the week, and very few give six days. Notwithstanding, however, this enormous limitation in the amount of labor actually applied, notwithstanding the idleness and thieving propensities charged against the peasantry, the first ten years of freedom, with one-third the number of laborers, have given at least as large, and I believe larger average crops than the last ten years of Slavery, with three times the hands. How is this fact explained, and how does it comport with the heavy and abounding complaints which we constantly hear? And how does it affect or bear upon the future prospects of the island? We should like to see the subject handled by some intelligent practical man, for really it suggests matter for consideration of great importance, and well deserving of mature and dispassionate consideration. It would also be satisfactory, and probably useful, to see correct and comparative statements of the expenses of an estate during Slavery and Freedom; for instance, what were the expenses of an estate that made one hundred hogsheads during Slavery, and what are the expenses of the same now; making the same quantity of sugar? Such and similar inquiries would enlighten, and lead to far different results than the mischief and ill-feeling which are created by the dogmatism and gratuitous railing which we so frequently hear in conversations and discussions relating to the state of the island. It is certainly consolatory to reflect, that whatever may have been the fate of some other islands, the average crop of Antigua has not diminished since emancipation, though she has had to strive against the disastrous effects of an unprecedented physical evil which the others in a great measure escaped. The prospect at present for next year, is exceedingly favorable, and with a continuance of seasonable weather, and the blessing of God upon our agricultural exertions, the ensuing crop is likely to be as large as the present.

From the Christian World.

AMERICAN SLAVERY AND BRITISH UNITARIANS.

In the reply which one hundred and thirty of our American Unitarian Ministers made to the Address of their British brethren on the subject of Slavery, it was somewhat too hastily taken for granted that the latter did not fully understand the nature of the connection between the different States of this Union; and had therefore erroneously ascribed a degree of responsibility to the inhabitants of the Northern States, in respect to the institution of Slavery, much beyond what really belongs to them. I would only stop here to hint that perhaps the American ministers were running into a very similar error to that against which they were protesting, when they undertook to declare or imply the existence of a state of mind in the ministers abroad, concerning which they had no sufficient proof.

Below are some extracts from several articles and letters on the subject, which have appeared in the London "Inquirer;" which, in justice to the signers of the British Address, ought to be reprinted here; which I had hoped to have seen reprinted before this; and which I hope may now be laid before the readers of the "Christian World." From reading these, it may be seen whether, or not, the writers have a correct understanding of the subject of which they treat. I beg also, in this connection, to refer to a very spirited and admirable editorial article, in the "Inquirer" of January 18th, entitled, "Conduct of American Slaveholders;" and which I much wish might soon have a place in the columns of the "World."

The first extract is from an editoral article in the "Inquirer" of November 9, 1844:

"We know all that is said of the different States of the American Union not having any right to interfere with each other's institutions: certainly they have no *political* right to declare those institutions null and void, but they are not the less bound, by the energetic expression of their own sense of right, by remonstrance, and by persuasion, to urge on their brethren, the necessity for some immediate measures. They are not the less obliged by public and political duty to protest against the whole system of Slavery, to declare themselves in danger of being degraded and contaminated by their union with States which maintain it, and insist on their right to discuss its merits in the national legislature. Every nation on the surface of the earth has a right to protest against the crimes of other States, and to endeavor, by all peaceable means at least, to put a stop to them; and it is preposterous to suppose, that fellow-citizens, so nearly connected as the members of the different States of a federal republic, are not entitled to use arguments, entreaties, and appeals to moral sentiment, in order to rouse their brethren to the performance of a duty at once moral and political."

The next extract is from a letter of James Haughton, a well-known and highly-respected gentleman of Dublin, to the editor of the "Inquirer." The letter is in the paper of January 18th: and I wish that the whole of it could be republished in the "Christian World."

"It is quite true, as stated in reply to our Ministers' Address, that the different States in the American Union are independent of each other as regards the abolition or maintenance of Slavery; but it is not stated in that document that Congress has the full right to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia,* and also full power to prohibit the internal traffic in slaves, which exists between the different slave States; and which has so branded with infamy the highest names in these States, that we are called on by every feeling of our nature, and by every sentiment of delicacy, to reject all fellowship with them. The occupation of many of them is, *breeding slaves for the Southern market;* and, as the progeny of black women [that is, female slaves] are all held as slaves—hear it, men and women of England, Ireland, and Scotland,—white men in America are often known to sell their own children! The family likeness which nature imprints on the features of the black as well as the white man, too truly proves the horrid fact."

The remainder of this communication will consist of a part of a letter addressed to the editor of the "Inquirer," by Rev. George Armstrong, of Bristol, and which is published in that paper for January 25; concerning which, I will only remark, that I heartily wish *as* correct an understanding as the writer evinces of our connection with Slavery, and our consequent moral responsibility, prevailed throughout New England. The days of Slavery would be numbered; and that number not hard to be reckoned:

"It might be injudicious, and on the part of an individual perhaps somewhat presumptuous, to offer any comment on the documents which, after a protracted interval, hitherto so very imperfectly accounted for, have arrived in this country, in answer to the 'Address on Slavery,' transmitted by a large proportion of the Unitarian ministers of Great Britain and Ireland to their clerical brethren in America. One simple remark, however, may not be out of place. It has been assumed in those documents, and frequently elsewhere, that persons in this country, from ignorance of the constitutional relation in which the several States of the American Union stand to each other, attribute to them a power of action in regard to Slavery, which in point of fact they do not possess. And very ignorant, indeed, they must be, not to know that the State of Massachusetts, for instance, has no direct power whatever, to interfere with "the peculiar institution" of Virginia, or any of its sister States in the South. Nay, more, that the Federal Government itself has no such power.

"The truth is, the ignorance supposed has no ex-

* This statement of Mr. Haughton's, though entirely correct in *letter*, still needs some qualification, in order that no injustice may be done to the American reply. In that reply, the District of Columbia and the territories are expressly excepted from the statement that the Northern States can exert no "direct political action" for the abolition of Slavery; and yet the Reply, as it proceeds with its argument, quite puts out of sight this fact of a direct participation of the free States, under the Constitution and laws of the country, in the support and continuance of Slavery.

istence whatever. These facts are, and were perfectly well known; together also, with some one or two other very significant facts, to which we do not find any reference made in any communications with which we have been favored by our brethren in America. I mean the facts, that slaves are held *in the District of Columbia*; that, in the city of Washington, situated in that District, and within sight of the Capitol, the palace of their Republican legislature, husbands, wives, and children, may be separated and *sold like so many beasts of the field*; while, nevertheless, the aforesaid District, with the aforesaid city of Washington, are, and always have been, *within the absolute control of Congress.*

"It thus appears, contrary to the palliation attempted in the alleged *want of power*, that a direct Federal sanction is given to Slavery, which involves in its opprobrium, every State, every church, and every individual, in those sections of the Union called free, where exertions, open, active and untiring, are not made to arouse the power of Congress to extinguish this system, at least in a locality thus distinctly know to be within the reach of its jurisdiction.

"Whether such exertions are made, whether any practical and adequate methods are adopted and pursued to this end,—and whether the CHURCHES OF CHRIST are heard to lift up their voices in furtherance and incitement of such efforts,—is one among the tests which the friends of humanity in Britain,—and those not least who hold, as they deem it, the religion of the Great Teacher, in its most elevated and loving form,—have been anxious that their brethren and fellow-worshippers in America might be able to produce, in evidence of their declared abhorrence of an institution disgraceful above all others to the character of our age; and especially to be deplored by the hopers and expectants of constitutional reforms *everywhere*, from its paralysing effects on the influence and example which America might otherwise so nobly maintain for the direction, encouragement, and blessing of the less fortunate portions of the great family of man." S. M.

From the Banner of the Covenant.

COVENANTERS AND SLAVERY.

Covenanters from their name and principles are opponents of Slavery. It will not be asserting too much to affirm, that they have ever been the foremost in the cause of human rights; that they were the first to assert doctrines now so loudly boasted of in this country. Who was it, after the nations of Europe had suffered a thousand years of unrebuked oppression and tyranny, that first dared to deny the divine right of kings? The Covenanters of Scotland. Who first proclaimed the immortal principle, in the face of fire, and sword, and death that the PEOPLE have the right to dethrone a tyrant, and choose one from among themselves, who will rule justly, in the fear of God? It was the Covenanters of Scotland, while opposing the unjust usurpations of the bloody house of Stuart. These, at that time, seemingly fanatical and treasonable theories, soon found their way among the puritans of England, and ere long burst into a flame of liberty. The old world, however, not affording a congenial soil for the growth and development of these principles, because its very atmosphere had been so long polluted with oppression and crime and blood; the puritan fathers, under the guidance of heaven, wisely sought a virgin continent, a land where Christian republicanism might flourish uninterrupted,—unpolluted. Yet notwithstanding the respect in which apostles of liberty on this western continent are held, we are free to say that they did not accomplish all that might have been done. Nor have their sons gone on to complete what they so nobly begun. While they contended for and secured the blessings of liberty for the mass, they tamely looked on with scarce a rebuke from the church or individuals, while the few—the robbed and defenceless Ethiopians, were enslaved. Their desires, though exalted, seemed to soar no higher than this—"The greatest good for the *greatest number*;" while the honor was reserved for Covenanters to publish and practice in this country a better system of ethics, and a more exalted form of civil polity: and that was, "The greatest good for the WHOLE NUMBER," and not one of God's humble poor left out. Soon after the revolutionary war, and the formation of the Federal Constitution, the Reformed Presbyterian Church having permanently established herself in this country, had had her attention called to the existence of Slavery to a considerable extent among the members of her communion. The subject was brought before the highest ecclesiastical judicature, when prompt and efficient action was at once taken. No temporary remedy—no gradualism—no colonization was permitted to have place.

A unanimous resolution was passed in the year 1800, that any of her members who were involved in the sin of Slavery must AT ONCE manumit their slaves, or of course leave the church. The importance of this resolution, as well as the difficulty of its execution, will at once be seen when it is remembered that one of the largest portions of the church was then in South Carolina, and many of the members slaveholders, or otherwise connected with the system. A committee was appointed to see that the resolution was fully carried out. And nearly half a century since, the now venerable pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian church in this city went to Carolina in company with another minister, long since gone to his rest, and saw the decision of the church carried fully into effect. And from that time to the present, no slaveholder or abetter of Slavery has been allowed any privilege in the church. There are also at the present time several organized congregations in Tennessee and Alabama, yet they are strictly anti-slavery. Had all the different churches in this country acted at as early a period in so definite a manner, there is no room to doubt that Slavery long ere this, would have been known only in history.

From the things thus briefly noticed, it will be evident that the Covenanters have a peculiar right, and it is their duty to speak plainly and earnestly on this subject, both to North and South. While thus acting, they are only carrying out their long-cherished theory and practice.

The poor slave, seeing his own tongue is made dumb by unrighteous laws, has also a right to expect each Covenanter to plead his cause before the country and the world. And he is unworthy the name who will be silent or say nay. Who so consistent, and with such hopes of success as Covenanters, can unite in a home missionary effort to our own oppressed millions, whom, notwithstanding their degradation, they have so long acknowledged as brethren? How can the slave, or the emancipated negro, be expected to receive the gospel message from those who have never dared to rebuke the robbery committed upon himself? And shall Ethiopia stretch out her hands in vain for missionary aid to the Reformed Presbyterian Church, which has so long advocated the rights of her children? God seems to have a controversy with the churches in this country, who are attempting to evangelize Africa. And why should it not be so? Will Africa—can she ever receive the gospel from persons whose hands are dripping with the blood of her long lost children? Will God, until He ceases to be just, ever bless such an effort? All these considerations call loudly on the Reformed Presbyterian Church, to extend, if possible, by missionary effort, her influence as far as Africa; which presents so inviting a field, and a prospect of such an abundant harvest.

These thoughts have been penned, not in the spirit of boasting—nor with a censorious feeling; but with a desire of briefly presenting this subject before the readers of the *Banner*. Far also be the desire to detract praise from those to whom it is due. The Quakers—those long tried philanthropists—were the first as a body in this country to act efficiently on this subject, and exclude from their connection the dealer in human chattels. But the desire of the writer is to call the more serious attention, not only of the members of our own church, but if possible the serious attention of every one in this land, who loves the Lord Jesus, and the extension of his kingdom, to this momentous subject. Slavery is no doubt the greatest obstacle which now opposes itself to the spread of the gospel. May God, then, incline the hearts of all Christians to unite in its speedy overthrow, and thus mightily assist in hastening on the period when the whole earth shall shine with His glory. S.

From the Liberator.

SYMPATHY OF ENGLISH PHILANTHROPISTS.

The following are the excellent resolutions, respecting the barbarous treatment of Messrs. Walker, Torrey, Fairbank, &c. &c.—alluded to in the letter of Elizabeth Pease.

At a meeting of the Committee of the Auxiliary Anti-Slavery Society for Darlington, county of Durham, and the vicinity, the following resolutions were unanimously agreed upon, 7th of March, 1845, to be signed by the Committee, and other friends of the cause, as time will permit.

JOHN CHURCH BACKHOUSE, Esq. in the chair.

Resolved, That we publicly express our deep sympathy for the valued individuals, now in the jails, &c. of Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, and Florida, on a charge of having aided some slaves to escape from their bondage.

That, so far from regarding as crimes the acts for which they are condemned to cruel punishments, by the slave courts of America, we believe them to be deeds of Christian charity.

That, in our view, the law of Slavery which condemns nearly three millions of innocent persons to perpetual bondage, with all its cruel incidents, is considered by all good men as morally null and void, as being a violation of the natural rights of man, and an invasion of the prerogatives of Almighty God.

That the wickedness of this law is more apparent, in that it requires laws equally iniquitous to sustain it—laws which denounce acts of humanity, and punish deeds of mercy with chains, imprisonment, and the pillory; reversing the Christian law, which requires that we should do unto others as we would they should do unto us.

That we therefore urgently call on the friends of humanity and religion, to enter their protest against the system of American Slavery, founded in iniquity, and upheld by oppression; and that we urge on the Christian philanthropists of the United States, the solemn duty of seeking, by every Christian and constitutional means, its immediate abolition, and the truth contained in their Declaration of Independence, that "God hath created all men equal, and endowed them with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Finally, that we tender our heartfelt sympathy to the wives and children of our imprisoned friends, and affectionately commend them to the protection of Him, who is the "God of the oppressed," and to the Christian regard of our fellow-laborers in the cause of oppressed humanity.

(Signed,) J. C. BACKHOUSE, Chairman.

Joseph Pease, Sen'r.	John Tanner,
John Backhouse,	Samuel Thompson,
Thos. Bowes,	Wm. Richardson,
Wm. Robson,	Geo. Middleton,
John B. Pease,	Michael Middleton,
Wm. Henderson,	John Middleton,
W. J. Scanlan,	John Livick,
Saml. Barnard,	John Readman,
Wm. Cudworth,	John Brodie,
Jas. Janson,	Frederick Stearns,
Joseph Nevill,	Wm. Furness,
Alex'r. Fothergill,	Sam'l. Barlow, Jr.
Thos. Oxendale,	Chas. Parker,
Wm. Backhouse,	Robert Reasdale,
J. Pease, Jr.	Jno. Harley,
Joseph Sams,	Richard Kitching,
Richard C. Pritchett,	Alfred Kitching,
G. D. Lightfoot,	Anthony Dinsdale,
Wm. Lightfoot,	Wm. Watson,
Wm. Janson,	John Smith,
Henry Barlow,	James Porter,
Samuel Barlow,	William Hawith,
John Manley,	Wm. Taylor,
Thos. B Speciall,	James Coates,
Wm. Thompson,	Edward Frank,
I. P. Cockshott,	Thos. McLachlan,
I. N. Potts;	Jas. Smith,
George Heighington,	George Simpson,
John Fothergill,	Wm. Foggitt,
Wm. Fothergill,	Robert Willis,
Joseph Bryar,	John Harris,
Richard Middleton,	John Kay,
Robert Hudson,	John Coule,
John C. Hopkins,	Charles Gollop,
Edward Oxley,	George Coates,
Wm. Rymer,	Robert Bland,
George Hinde,	Christopher Watkin,
George Cradock,	P. E. Cowper,
Jonathan Dresser,	Robert Johnson,
Edward Kipling,	Wm. Bilton,
John Tophan,	William Heron,
Wm. Kitching,	Joseph Bowron,
John Coates,	Joseph Sparket,
William Wilson,	George Walters.
Wm. Fossick,	John Deighton.

From the Liberator.

HAYTIEN CORRESPONDENCE.

We are indebted to Mrs. Chapman for the following translation of some highly valued and very encouraging documents which we have just received from distinguished Haytien lovers of liberty, with whom we shall ever be proud to co-operate in the cause of universal emancipation.

PORT REPUBLICAN, Hayti, March 21, 1845.

W. L. GARRISON, Boston:

Though it is long since any correspondence has passed between us, yet circumstances now seem to call for the revival of our old intercourse.

Hayti is at present the object of European observation. The revolution of the 3d May, 1844, has placed the chief magistracy of the country in the hands of a man who, by his patriotism, his wisdom, his liberal principles, and his military genius, has ever merited the esteem and the veneration of his fellow-citizens. At the head of his administration are sound men of high moral principle, and friends of the country; enlightened patriots and just magistrates, who all feel that happiness can only come through Liberty; and therefore, their zeal and their efforts in the cause of freedom augment day by day.

The calumniators of our race agree wonderfully in the maintenance of Slavery, but disagree and contradict each other, and even tremble, when they are asked a reason for its continuance. Let us not despair;—*but cut the Gordian knot which they cannot undo.*

The enemies of our republic take pleasure in injuring us in the eyes of the civilized world, and in filling their journals with atrocious calumnies, and infamous falsehoods, by way of demonstrating that division of caste and massacre are the fruits of the revolution which has just taken place. It is untrue. The children of the same mother cannot be divided. The Haytiens are united, and so will remain. Their mission on earth is not yet accomplished.

I have not forgotten your letter of 22d of August, 1832. It is at once a proof of your friendship, and of those pure principles which characterize you. The picture is the ornament of my room, and is much admired.

I am, as you may have learned, the agent for Haytien emigration; and if you know of any planters who wish to liberate their slaves, or free people of color who wish to come hither, I beg you to be so good as to give them my address. To succeed here, they should be industrious, moral men, who will not fall into idle habits. Many artisans of Philadelphia and its environs are thinking of coming hither, on the representations of Mr. Amos. This worthy man keeps up a constant correspondence with me.

A society for the abolition of Slavery is about to be formed at Port Republican, [Port au Prince,] and its ramifications will extend throughout the other communes. They are occupied at present with the preparation of the Constitution. A meeting, of which I had the honor to be President, has been held recently, to reply to the address of London philanthropists to the Haytien people and government. I send you a copy of the reply, [not yet printed,] and some numbers of the *Moniteur Haitien*, which will put you in possession of our latest proceedings. In one of these you will see the proposition made to our Cabinet by Mr. Doran, an English merchant.* Neither of these proposals have yet obtained an answer; but in case of a favorable one, may I beg you to put me in correspondence on the subject with gentlemen among your ship-owners, of known philanthropic principles, like Mr. Eben. Wheelwright?

Asking the favor of a reply, and entreating you to receive the assurance of my entire consideration, I pray God to prolong your life, and to bless you and your family. (Signed,) CH. CUPIDON.

P. S. I send you enclosed, a list of excellent names, to be inscribed on the list of Abolitionists, as I trust you have done by mine long since. If not, pray cause it to be done. The list is as follows:

Messrs. Cupidon, Linstant, Dorvelas Dowal, Dumai Lespinasse, Senoit, Soisson pere, Guerrier jenne, Laforestrie.

You will receive also a letter from M. Instant, who has had the advantage of making your acquaintance in England. He is a most excellent man.

*To establish a company for the cultivation of sugar and coffee plantations, in the Arondissement of Jacmel. —*Ed. Lib.*

PORT REPUBLICAN, the 10th March, 1845.

To the members of the Anti-Slavery Society:

DEAR FRIENDS:—Across the eighteen hundred leagues of ocean which separate us from you, the noise of our dissensions has reached your ears. You are moved by our condition, and have addressed us in words of peace and good-will. This new mark of your solicitude for whatever concerns the African race, gives us no astonishment.* Pious and generous men, whose efforts have caused the abolition of the slave-trade, English philanthropists, who have by their perseverance obtained of their Government the emancipation of the blacks, could not remain indifferent to the fate of the young republic of Hayti. They will continue the work they have so generously begun. In regularly organized society, it is the tendency of good to perpetuate itself, as it is that of evil to disappear.

Since the Haytiens first conquered their independence, they have never lost sight of their great mission to humanity. If they could ever forget it, the groans of millions of their brethren, under the lash of inhuman masters, and the exhortations of the friends of their race, crying to them unceasingly, "Onward—onward!" would recall it to their remembrance, and they would still be responsible for every moment of delay. They decline not their responsibility in the work of regeneration for the African family. They assume it as men, as Christians, as sons of Africa. The genius of the Antilles cannot forget that she also has known the sorrows of servitude—the anguish, the tortures of Slavery; and she says to herself—"*Non ignora mali, miseris, succurrere disco.*"

Our most ardent desire is to sustain towards all our brethren, of what nation soever they may be, with whatever color it may have pleased he Creator to tinge their brows, relations of peace and friendship. If on the day of battle we were pitiless towards those who denied us the right of being free and independent, we can yet, when the strife has terminated, recognize our adversaries to be men and brethren; we are ready to share with them the common advantages that our land offers to friendly nations. We believe that hatred and revenge ought never to exist off the field of battle: for peace should be to all the guaranty of happiness and prosperity.

Obedient to the counsel of the founders of our republic, never to entangle ourselves in the affairs of neighbors, we claim of others the same principles of justice and respect for the law of nations. But if any nation, forgetting or despising this spirit of conciliation and brotherhood which animates us, should dream, in its folly, of the conquest of the Haytien soil,—if there should unfortunately be found, either in governments or people, men base enough to counsel such a work of iniquity, no matter by what name decorated,—then the Haytiens of the new generation, under the banner of their fathers, would invoke the shades of the heroes of 1804, and maintain that liberty and independence that their fathers won by their most precious sacrifices and their purest blood.

There is nothing in the agitations which our country has recently experienced, which ought to alarm the friends of our cause. They are common to all nations just emerging from infancy, and who shake off with energy the bonds in which they feel that they have been too long enveloped. Thus have we done—but without hatred—without vengeance. The history of nations offers few examples of so great a revolution effected without effusion of blood. Hayti has advanced; slowly, it is true, but the observing eye of the statesman and philosopher is able to trace the progress she has made in the way of civilization. This result ought to cherish the friends of humanity. It was impossible, amid the shock of conflicting passions, that some disorders should not occur. They are the inseparable consequences of popular crises. But tranquillity is restored. A brighter day begins to appear in the horizon, for a short time darkened by the tempest. Every one feels the necessity of putting in motion the wheels of Government which the recent troubles had arrested. Our efforts are for the establishment of peace and concord in the bosom of society. Who can be stupid enough to dream, in the midst of this new labor of organizing a Government, of fomenting the difficulties in our land? Where is the Haytien that can be so forgetful of the lessons of the past, as to class the members of the great Haytien family according to the shade of their complexion, and thus make them the blind and docile instruments of their enemies? We have all the same origin—we are all brethren: and if these bonds were not strong enough, our common misfortunes would be to us an imperative law of the closest union. Our forefathers sacrificed all things, to give us a country, and to destroy the prejudice of color, that selfish spirits had cherished against us. Could we be so ungrateful as to embrace for ourselves doctrines that we have detested in others?

The words, "war of caste" have been thrown out by men angry to see Hayti springing forward so freely in her onward course. They thought the words would find an echo among us: they were mistaken. Let them know, at length, that on the soil of Hayti, there dwell only Haytiens and patriots.

Our enemies, in declaring that a "war of caste" was yet possible in Hayti, have calumniated us; and, as they ever do, have manifested a signal degree of bad faith, and ignorance of our social condition. They have counted their wishes for probabilities. Blinded by their hatred, they forget that forty years have effaced in our hearts the germs of discord that they sowed with so much care. Our unanimity in the re-establishment of order and tranquillity damps the hopes of these evil-minded men, and defeats their destructive projects. We pity these wretched beings, whose misery is thus occasioned by the happiness of others: and we generously offer a hospitable asylum in our native land, even to those who refuse the name of man to us in theirs.

It is true that Hayti is far from being on a level with those nations which are the admiration of the world for their science, their wealth, and their civilization. We are but of yesterday, and our slanderers cannot with justice make use of our ignorance as a weapon against us. Even your own generous nation was but a horde of barbarians when the Romans made the conquest of its territory. Courageous they were, it is true, but still so uncultivated as to tempt their enemies to make slaves of them. See now how from those thick forests and those marshy plains of Britain, proud cities have grown up—vast depots of human science. The Druidical stones have given place to majestic temples, where now resound the hymns to the living God. The markets to which once came the Irish purchaser for British slaves, are now thronged with Christians seeking to relieve their brethren, without exception of color or of clime.

How many ages have been required to effect so great a transformation! The growth of nations is slow. Let us not, then, despair. The same God hath created us all, and he has not ordained, in his wisdom, that some of his children should always make progress, while others grope in eternal ignorance. We have faith in his justice: the Future is our own.

Already is our nation reorganized, and political institutions established on the surest foundations. Public instruction is the object, a constant solicitude of the Government; our schools are filled with young Haytiens, who thence draw solid knowledge, and thus prepare themselves worthily to serve their country. Agriculture, that had necessarily been checked by the recent events, begins again to flourish; and everywhere the most active means are employed, that the productions of our soil may no longer be depreciated in foreign markets. Circumstances, while arresting our means of production, have created new wants, and somewhat deranged our finances; but we foresee with satisfaction that a just proportion will erewhile be established between our receipts and our expenditures, by means of the judicious economy introduced into certain branches of our administration. Commerce, too, begins to feel the new impulse, and to recover its original activity, and to enlarge the circle of its operations. All labor with ardor, because all see only peace and safety in the future.

It is thus, dear friends, that we reply to the treacherous insinuations of our calumniators. We bear them no ill will for the uneasy watchfulness they exercise over us. It prevents us, perhaps, from falling into those errors to which a too great self-confidence might lead. Nations, like individuals, ought to be able to profit even by the malice of enemies.

We thank you sincerely, tried and true friends, for the words of encouragement and kindly counsel with which you have addressed us: our gratitude is ever yours. May our Common Father grant you the satisfaction of beholding the consummation of your noble efforts for the extinction of Slavery throughout the world. Without having seen—without having known you personally, we can yet across the distance that separates us, sustain those sweet relations of friendship and fraternity, which make the charm of human existence.

[The original is numerously signed.]

Communications.

Slavery.

On this subject I have read, with much interest, a very able correspondence between the Rev. R. Fuller and Dr. Wayland, in which it is admitted, that Slavery did exist among the Jews, and was regulated by scriptural authority under the old dispensation; that it was universal at the Christian era, and that some of the primitive disciples held slaves; that slaves were then exhorted to be contented in their situation, and that all men were admonished to yield obedience to the laws; for rulers were said not to be a terror to good works, but to evil. From these authorities, without further inquiry, I am able to say, that if a Christian man is held in Slavery by authority of the municipal law of the country in which he resides, his duty is to be contented with his situation, and to yield implicit obedience to those laws. A Christian slave cannot flee from his master's service, nor can a disciple of Christ excite slaves to rebellion, or aid, abet, or assist them to escape from such service. And all this is equally true, whether Slavery be sinful or not. If, by his act, the slaveholder commits a breach of the moral principles of the gospel, it is nevertheless the duty of the Christian slave to submit to the requirements of the municipal law. The exhortation, therefore, to the slave, to be contented with his situation, does not prove that Slavery is consistent with the moral principles of the gospel. Nor does the existence or regulation of Slavery under the old dispensation, prove it to have been consistent with those principles. If the Patriarch Abraham was now living, he could not be admitted to a Christian communion table. We account a planter, who has illicit connection with his bond-women or slaves to be a man of bad moral character; but I think, even under that dark dispensation, the true light did occasionally appear. The prophet Isaiah, undoubtedly had reference to Slavery in the 58th chapter, 6th verse, of his book, in which he says: "Is not this fast that I have chosen to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke." Slavery, in its origin, is effected, or brought about by means wholly inconsistent with the great moral principles of the gospel. A slave is always made such by war and carnage. Mr. Fuller will no doubt admit, that the Christian man could never have been concerned in the original reduction of any free man to a state of slavery; this must have been effected by wicked men.

It is not said in the Holy Scriptures, in so many words, that Slavery is or is not a sin against God. I am, nevertheless, satisfied that it is wholly irreconcilable with the spirit of the gospel, and that the argument of Dr. Wayland, going to show that the Scriptures generally teach by moral principles in place of special precepts, is undoubtedly sound; that if the latter method had been pursued, and every species of sin that mortals can commit, had been particularized, and singly and specially prohibited, that no library would have been large enough to have contained the books in which all those precepts should have been written. If, therefore, it be admitted, that Slavery cannot be reconciled with the great principles of the gospel, and that it is not expressly declared to be harmless, the result is, that a Christian man cannot, unless laboring under peculiar circumstances, hold slaves. This position brings me to the principal questions that I intend to consider.

1st. Whether a Christian man can, under any circumstances, hold slaves; and

2d. Whether abolition ought to be immediate or gradual.

I entertain no doubt whatever but that a practical Christian can hold slaves. Suppose he is born and brought up in a slave State, and inherits a plantation with the slaves upon it; that he treats them with Christian kindness and affection; that he gives them proper religious instruction, and that it is either unlawful or inexpedient to manumit them—all of which certainly does occur. I consider, under such circumstances, that he is acquitted of the guilt of Slavery, although I admit that Slavery, in the abstract, is sinful. But I believe that the intelligent Christian slaveholder will, nevertheless, be constantly impressed with the idea, that Slavery is inconsistent with the moral principles of the gospel, and will exert himself to bring about general emancipation.

And I am inclined to think, also, that if slaveholders generally were obliged to treat their slaves as a Christian man feels bound to treat his, that slavery would become unprofitable, and be abandoned.

In respect to immediate emancipation in the Southern States, I am decidedly opposed to it.

I hold that a Christian man may not only hold slaves under certain circumstances, but that it would be morally wrong in him to manumit them. I suppose that both the slave and the master, require preparation for general emancipation, and that if it should take place without that preparation, that it would endanger the peace and welfare of the State. The slaves are now uneducated and not properly instructed in gospel principles, and to manumit them in this condition, would greatly endanger the peace of the State, and would require a standing army, as in the British dominions, to keep them in subjection. I have myself spent a winter in the West India Islands, and I am satisfied that our English friends have committed a serious error in immediate emancipation. A large portion of the slaves are idle, shiftless members of society; begging is a common profession; they work when they please, and many of them for much of the time remain idle. The Danish Government have lately caused large schoolhouses to be erected in their Islands for the education of slaves, and a portion of the week is by law allotted to them to attend school. That Government is no doubt preparing for gradual emancipation, and is endeavoring to steer clear of the error committed by our English friends. The consequence of immediate emancipation in the English dominions, is likely in time to destroy the very people it was intended to benefit. And it is to be apprehended that the same consequences would now result from a like measure, in some of the Southern States.

I understand both of the talented disputants to admit, that if the fact be established that Slavery is contrary to the doctrines of the gospel, that then immediate emancipation should take place, whatever may be the consequences—it is this position mainly that the writer intends to combat. It will be admitted that St. Paul knew whether Slavery was or was not sinful—if he knew it to be sinful, and did not exhort the primitive disciples to immediate emancipation, he would, if this position be correct, have failed in an important duty.

I verily believe he knew it to conflict with the principles of the gospel, but that he foresaw that manumission ought to be brought about by the operation of those principles upon the heart, and not by special precept or command; special precept or command might in such case have operated upon the disciples only, and partial abolition have endangered the State; or there might have been a law of the State prohibiting it. One article of the decalogue is, "Thou shalt not kill." Now, suppose it probable that, by immediate emancipation in the State of South Carolina, where the black population greatly exceeds the white, that a general massacre might take place, would emancipation, with such an apprehension, be an immediate duty, whatever might be the consequences? The Legislature of that State have apprehended that such might be the consequences of manumission, and they have accordingly passed laws regulating it. The act of manumission, therefore, which gentlemen say ought to take place immediately, might, and probably would, lead in its consequences to a breach of the law of God, in the violation of one of the most important articles of the decalogue.

It is admitted that there can be no excuse for not performing any of the expressed commands of the Almighty, as contained in the decalogue.

The performance of any of these commands will not endanger the state of society; but by the act of manumission, which these gentlemen suppose to be an immediate duty, the State may be endangered. And from this very probable consequence, these gentlemen are called upon to consider, whether there is not a manifest difference between the performance of a law of God, or the conformity to a principle of the gospel, as to the time and manner of such compliance? In other words, is there not a harmony in the operation of the blessed principles of the gospel, which deserves to be considered by the disciples of Christ. We are commanded to be obedient to the law of the land; but if, by immediate emancipation, we commit a breach of that law, ought we not to pause before we disobey this inculcation? We are commanded not to kill; but if, in consequence of emancipation, thousands are killed, ought the disciple of Christ to manumit notwithstanding the consequences? It will be found on examination, that whatever God has expressly enjoined upon his people, (as in the articles of the decalogue,) does not conflict at all with the safety of a State; but what is left to be worked out by the principles of the blessed gospel, can only, in many instances, be brought about with safety to the body politic, by the operation of these principles upon the heart. Both the slave and the master are properly prepared for a change from slavery to freedom by the benign principles of the gospel.

The State of South Carolina, at the last census, in 1830, had a free white population of 258,000 souls, a free black population of 8,000, and a slave population of 315,000—making in all, 323,000 blacks to 258,000 whites.

This slave population is now much greater, and is continually increasing. Any one can foresee, that such a state of things cannot continue very long. The State will be surcharged, and a ruinous condition of things must be the consequence. If Texas should be annexed to the United States, it might afford a market for their slaves. It is believed that the apprehensions of slaveholders are sufficiently awake on this subject to lead them to an alienation of this description of property, and that the slaves of the Southern States would, in that case, be principally transferred to Texas. Even if immediate emancipation was deemed advisable, we have not the same means which the British Government had to effect it. They paid to the planters one hundred millions of dollars for their slaves. There is no Government here that has the means to pay for slaves. The slave States themselves are poor, and in the providence of God, they always will be poor; for Slavery impoverishes a nation. It is with States as with individuals. "He that commits sin swallows poison, which from that moment begins to operate."

Suppose that Dr. Wayland's views should prevail, and a law of South Carolina be passed for immediate emancipation, what would be the consequence? Most of the planters would be reduced to poverty. The slave population greatly outnumbers the free, and in its present condition, being ignorant, and without a proper sense of moral principles, would probably take vengeance on their former masters, and a state of anarchy and bloodshed of a shocking character might ensue. I appeal to Dr. Wayland, whether he could contemplate such a change in the affairs of South Carolina with complacency? I am sure he could not. That a crazy Abolitionist might rejoice in it, is not improbable, but that the rational Christian would everywhere mourn over it, is quite certain.

The present predicament of some of our slaveholding States, requires for their alleviation, wise, moderate, and Christian measures. And I suggest to Dr. Wayland, whether the most efficacious means now to be employed is not the preaching the gospel?

Neither the slave nor the master are prepared for immediate emancipation. The instruction of the slave in moral and religious principles should be the first object, after which the State might commence with laws for gradual emancipation. I hope our Southern brethren will not allow themselves to be excited by the denunciations of Abolitionists. I believe wise, good, and discreet men at the North, are unanimously opposed to the conduct of those individuals. Abolition is desirable, but the means of effecting it require great wisdom, patience, and forbearance.

JAMES SMITH,
Counsellor at Law, New York.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1845.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

ELEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The American Anti-Slavery Society will hold its annual meeting in this city, at the Tabernacle, on Tuesday, the sixth day of May next, commencing at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The meeting of the Society has never been held at a more momentous crisis. After ten years of toil and danger, the Society, at its last meeting, adopted the revolutionary motto by which it is now distinguished. One year has been sufficient to prove the wisdom of assuming its present position. It has raised a standard which it can never lower without dishonor, and which can alone lead it to victory. The events of the last year have shown, beyond a question, that a union with slaveholders is a curse to the slave, and must end in making slaves of Freemen. The alternative of Liberty or Slavery has been presented without disguise to the people, and the majority have solemnly and unhesitatingly chosen the latter. The only hope of the slave, and the only choice for Freemen is in peaceful revolution, and in the destruction of a Union which was begun in a compromise with evil, and has continued in infamy.

A large and deeply interesting meeting is expected. But this must not be left to chance. The auxiliary societies in towns and counties, should take immediate measures for the appointment of delegates, that every section of country may be fully represented. And every individual member, who can by any possibility make arrangements to be present, should be a self-appointed delegate. The counsels of the warm, and true-hearted, and the clear-headed are needed, that the interests and the necessities of the cause everywhere may be fully known, and the wisest action, and the most effective plans for the dissemination of anti-slavery truth for the coming year be proposed and carried into effect. We need especially, *associated action*, at this moment, and the friends everywhere should see to it that the gathering be a mighty one, and worthy of the hour and the cause.

The arrangements for the business meetings will be advertised in the next Standard.

EDMUND QUINCY,
FRANCIS JACKSON,
SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, } Committee of Arrangements.

NEW-YORK, March 10, 1845.

Prejudice and Presbyterianism.

It is a striking fact that in the British West Indies, when the relation of master and slave ceased to exist, the prejudice against color was almost instantly forgotten. The moment the negro ceased to be a slave, the curse of caste was taken from his race, and he stepped at once, into the social position to which his character or his education entitled him. The ermine of the judge, the gown of the lawyer, the robes of the priest, or the uniform of the soldier, it was found lost none of their virtue when the form they covered was a black one rather than a white; for legislator or the laborer alike found his place according to the social laws by which both were surrounded, without regard to the hue of the skin. It is true the great mass of the emancipated people still remain as peasants, but this is because inequality of condition exists among men from other causes. All who were capable of transcending these barriers, at once naturally and easily, when prejudice against color was removed, assumed their proper positions in society.

If any proof were needed, this fact would be sufficient to show that the prejudice is in itself unnatural, or rather that it is a misnomer. It is not prejudice against color, but against condition. The slave is hated and despised, not because he is a black man, but because he is a slave. When his condition is changed, the cause and the effect cease together. But the necessary intimate intercourse between the two classes in a slaveholding community, while it teaches practically—whatever may be the theory—that the negro is in no degree inferior to the white man, prepares the way for the acknowledgment of all his rights, when the barriers which Slavery creates shall be removed. But when, as in our Northern States, men are so far removed from Slavery as not to have any of that intimate connection with the colored race which Slavery engenders, nor so far distant but that the prejudice against them exists in all its vigor, it is there that it has the most virulence, and is the most difficult to overcome. The Southerner oppresses the negro both bond and free, because he thinks it his interest to do so, and not because he hates him for his color. The Northerner, without the excuse of the other, despises him for his condition, and hates him for his color, and treats him as the Southerner would not do, should he cease to be a slaveholder. The one is, in some sort, a tyrant by position, but will be so no longer when the temptation ceases. The other is a tyrant without the temptation, and from the mere spirit of caste.

A singular proof of this has recently occured in this city. A Southerner and a slaveholder arrived here from Europe where he had been sojourning for several years. His travelling companion was a colored man, but one in whose veins the African blood was so sparsely mingled, that it served only to give that rich tint to his complexion, and that character of form and feature, which makes his race by common consent the very beau ideal of physical beauty. The two were received at one of the first hotels with the attention which wealth and the bearing of gentlemen in such places always commands. In the bar-room, at the public table, at the theatre, in all places of fashionable resort, the keen-eyed caterers to popular taste and popular prejudice could not discern that one of these men was of a proscribed race. Wherever he went, in town or country, at Niagara, at the Springs, in the cars, the stages, or on steamboats, among the delicately fastidious, or the not less vulgar, but more coarsely prejudiced, no look or action from any one reminded him that he did not bear upon his face his title to humanity. This was not, indeed, because the wearer of a dark skin was not hated in all these places, but because his was so slightly colored that its tinge was hardly perceptible. And it may be that as the magic name of a foreign city was opposite his name in hotel and road books, his bronzed complexion, if observed at all, was considered only as the mark of foreign birth. Perhaps he was mistaken for an Italian count; and this among our republicans, would entitle him to more respect than if he were merely a man, even had it been known that some of "the best blood of Virginia was coursing through his veins." But he was not to remain incognito always.

His companion left him, to return to the South, and he took up his residence in one of the most fashionable streets in the city. No objection was made among the "upper ten thousand" at this contamination of good brick and mortar, for his character for whiteness was still unimpeached. White servants worked as readily and as cheerfully in his kitchen as in any other, and white butchers and bakers took his money without demur for their meat and bread. In short, he was to all intents and purposes, a white man, and might, but for one unforeseen accident, have remained so to the day of his death, and received white burial, and have then gone to Heaven, where should such a mistake be discovered, it would be too late to remedy it. But the mark which the sharp eyes of the world's people failed to see, it was reserved for the conservators of the peace in a Christian church to descry.

He became acquainted with a veritable white man who was the deacon of a neighboring church. This worthy man, believing that his colored brother—for he knew him to be such—had a soul to be saved, and that it would be an acceptable service to Him "who is no respecter of persons," if he could be brought under the Presbyterian dispensation of the gospel, invited him, with his wife, to occupy seats in his—the deacon's—pew. The invitation was gladly accepted, and for several successive Sundays, the deacon ushered his friends up the broad aisle of the 7th Presbyterian Church, at the corner of Ridge and Broome streets, to listen to the spiritual teachings of the pastor, the Rev. Edwin F. Hatfield.

Now surely this was no heinous sin. Jesus, and Mary, and Paul, and John, and others whose names are ever on the lips of the pious worshippers in the 7th Presbyterian Church, were of as dark a hue as these two strangers. Had it been the virgin mother and her son, with their dark olive complexions, and in the humble garb of the common people of Judea, who sat there those few Sundays in the deacon's pew, would the Rev. Mr. Hatfield and his flock have snuffed a tainted air? It is a question worthy of consideration.

It is not my place to judge of motives. I neither know nor care whether the prayers of the pastor and his flock for the conversion of sinners, and the salvation of souls were earnest and sincere, or whether a reservation was made excluding souls in dark-hued bodies. I only know that it so fell out that the seed fell on good ground, and brought forth fruit. In the innocence and ignorance of their hearts believing that the gospel was proclaimed for all men, our friends soon learned to believe that that way lay their salvation also. They became, in the current phrase, converted,—or at least the man was about to ask admission to the church.

In the meantime, however, their friend, the deacon, was expostulated with. The enormity of his conduct was set before him, and he was requested to remove the cause of offence. After prayerful consideration of his duty, he refused, as an humble and sincere Christian should, and left the guardians of the flock to take such further measures, as, in such distressing circumstances, should seem to them right. It was a case requiring prompt and energetic measures. The peace of the church was at stake, and these humble disciples of the man who gave the new commandment of love to all men, and would have his gospel preached to "every creature," were not long in deciding what course to pursue. They met the colored brother one Sunday morning on the threshold of the church and forbade his entrance.

At least they forbade him to enter the body of the church, but told him, that he might find a bench in the gallery. I will not do them injustice, by overstating the fact. It was not probably his salvation that they objected to. Doubtless they would have him saved, if he could be as a black man, and without infringing upon the holy proprieties of this Christian Church. But they could conceive of no obligation to save him as a white man. The distinction is a nice one, but yet easily acted upon in practice. The

cipator asks us to show, if we can, *how* Dissolution will dissolve us from the guilt in the support of Slavery. The thing is so self-evident, that I marvel that any one not a "fool"—which the editor of the Emancipator is not, whatever he may think of the Disunionists—should ask the question. A man ceases to be guilty of slaveholding whenever he ceases to be a slaveholder. It is as true of States as it is of individuals.

He further says:

"But it (Dissolution) won't bring them (the Southerners) to their senses, because they fear only votes, and you do nothing but talk. Will you get up a Dissolution party, and have Dissolution candidates, and cast Dissolution *votes?* Or will you pitch a Dissolution camp, cast Dissolution cannon, and run Dissolution bullets? One or the other course you will take, or frighten nobody. To talk Dissolution, and vote not at all, or vote with one of the pro-slavery parties, will bring about the frightening of the slaveholders, and the Dissolution of the Union at precisely the same time, to wit, the day after the last."

Here is the whole philosophy of the Third party in a nutshell. There is no power in the world, but the power of the ballot-box and bullets—no moral action on men, but through their fears—and no faith, but in force. There is infinite virtue in party tactics, infinite wisdom in a Third party ticket, infinite power in a Yankee "March meeting," and the end of all preaching is to choose the constable. What madness is it to "do nothing but talk!" Nevertheless, just such a no-thing did Jesus, and Paul, and Martin Luther, and John Knox, and Penn,—not without results. The editor of the Emancipator would have made a better first lieutenant to Mahomet, than Apostle to Jesus, and would have thought John Robinson talked nonsense, when he said "it was a pity they had not converted the Heathen instead of killing them."

Notwithstanding we believe in "talk" still. Talk does much, the least of which is to make political parties. Neither is our aim to frighten slaveholders. We would frighten nobody, but convert a great many. We believe yet that the slaveholders have souls, and consciences, and common sense, and that enlightened consciences, and enlightened self-interest, through the power of "talk," will yet abolish Slavery. If it will not, it will at least abolish our connection with a system of wrong, and though we choose no constables, we shall have no blood upon our hands.

Again:

"But if your 'position' should *not* 'bring the Southerners to their senses,' then one of the two things will happen, either you will get Dissolution or you won't. If the former, you will have lost what little power the Union gave you to help the slave; if the latter, you will have made fools of yourselves and lost your time."

If we get Dissolution, we shall have done one thing—wiped off the guilt of slaveholding from the North, and made a nation of Freemen—certainly a thing worth striving for. If we do not get it, we shall have freed ourselves as individuals, from guilt, for he is never a fool who obeys the dictates of his conscience, and no time is lost in trying to live a true life,—the Reverend editor of the Emancipator to the contrary, notwithstanding. But if we do not get Dissolution, it will be because it will not be needed, and the Union will be continued, in which there shall be neither master nor slave.

The editor further says:

"And to work for the abolition of Slavery, which you do not deny may be as easily effected as the dissolution of the Union—is not that to change public sentiment? The difference between us is this, as fast as we get public sentiment changed, we *use it* on the only machinery which can peacefully abolish Slavery; as fast as you get it changed, you don't use it for that purpose, but let it go on still to support Slavery.

The difficulty is, you are not working for the abolition of Slavery, but to put your partisans in office, which is a very different matter. "And the difference between us, is," that we so change "public sentiment" that it will neither do a wrong thing, nor swear to do it; you only change it in part, so that while it refuses to support a pro-slavery party, it continues to support a slaveholding Union; and at the same time that it swears to support it entirely, perjures itself by refusing to obey a part of its requirements. Will you tell me which "public sentiment" supports Slavery most—that which swears to do so, but does so only in part? or that which will neither do it, nor swear to?—G.

The True Wesleyan.

This paper of last week has a long article with the caption—"The National Anti-Slavery Standard, *vs.* Wesleyans." The Standard is versus nothing but Slavery, and its supporters. If the Wesleyans come under this last category, it is against them, but not otherwise. The want of kind temper displayed in declaring my article to be "manifestly the child of prejudice, and a determination to sustain a position, right or wrong," argues something of a consciousness of weakness in his position, on the part of our contemporary. In endeavoring to show that he is not entitled to membership in the "Brotherhood of Thieves," there is no absolute necessity of proving that he belongs to the Brotherhood of Defamers. But he can do as he pleases about that. My purpose still is to come at the simple truth, though the Wesleyan does not seem much inclined to assist me.

In answer to my first proposition in relation to the pro-slavery character of the American Church, the Wesleyan says:

It is a sufficient reply to this, to say, that, if it be notorious that the churches are generally pro-slavery, is it no less notorious that the Wesleyans separated from their former church, *on the ground of their pro-slavery character.* This the Standard knows, and this throws the burden of proof upon him. The publicly known fact, that the Wesleyans seceded from the church of which they were members, because it was pro-slavery, leaving their church property behind, "is prima facie evidence of being" anti-slavery.

The very common error is committed here, of begging the main question at issue. Granting the notoriety of the fact stated, that the Wesleyans separated from the old church, on anti-slavery grounds, it is equally notorious—which the Wesleyan fails to state—that one chief cause of division was the ecclesiastical form of Government which the old church maintains. That paper has for its mottoes, certain sayings of Wesley in regard to Slavery, and certain other sayings of his in relation to Bishops,—equal importance apparently being given to each. Whether the secession was mainly for a difference in religious faith and practice, or only for ecclesiastical reasons, does not so plainly appear,

Now, the position, influence, and character of the old church is pro-slavery. The point at issue, then, is, whether the new church has so thoroughly and effectually withdrawn herself from the old, as to have assumed a new position, exercised a new influence, and maintained a new character. She is anti-Bishop, as a question of church government; is she equally anti-slavery, as a question of Christian morality? It amounts to just nothing at all to say that she was anti-slavery three or four years ago. Is she now?

The Wesleyan says they "deal with Slavery as with other acknowledged sins." We want more than assertion; we want proof. The editor is called to the bar of public opinion to testify as a witness, and he fails to answer the questions put to him. I ask again,—Do you deal with all who support Slavery in Church *and in State*, as you would deal with the same persons did they commit or support horse-stealing or adultery, ecclasiastically or politically? Is the course pursued by Mr. Smith, of Pittsburg, with the young man who voted the Whig ticket, the exception or the general rule in your church? Will you show that neither Whigs nor Democrats are admitted to your church, or when found there, that they are dealt with as Mr. Smith deals with them? A categorical answer to these questions will do much to bring us to a true understanding.

Again;—Are you in fact entirely separated from the old church? You assume that you are, which assumption is the thing you are called upon to show to be true. I repeat again the questions which you fail to answer, and which you are careful your readers shall not see:—"Would not your ministers exchange with the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church? And do you not covet the distinction of being recognized by the old mother as good Methodists?" And further,—do you not recognize the old church as a Christian church? Unless you can answer these questions in the negative, it seems to me, that you will stand condemned by your own acknowledged principle, that Slavery is a sin, as a pro-slavery, and therefore an anti-Christian, church.

I think I may go further. According to your own acknowledgment, you receive candidates for admission with letters from the old church. True, you say:

1st. We do not receive members into our churches *because* they have letters from any other church, or *because* they have been members of any other church, but *because*, in view of the evidence we have, we believe them to be consistent Christians.

2d. A letter from another church is admitted in evidence, as far as it goes, and no farther. If a church is known to insist on certain traits of Christian character, it would be considered proof of the existence of those traits, in the absence of proof to the contrary. If the church was known not to insist on other traits of Christian character, the letter would not be considered as furnishing any proof of those traits; and an examination would be just as necessary as though the person had never belonged to any church.

But what does all this mean, except that you regard these letters as coming from one Christian church to another? You would not, I presume, receive such letters at all from a Unitarian, or a Universalist church, simply because you do not regard them as fundamentally Christian. Certainly you would not, from a Catholic Church, or the priests of a Turkish Mosque, if either of these give letters. Yet you will not deny that a Catholic or a Mussulman may have certain qualities which Christianity enjoins. It follows, then, that the act of receiving letters is, in some sort, Christian fellowship, and that they are regarded as evidence of Christian character to a certain extent.

The Wesleyan may regard this also as "special pleading." But these questions and positions are neither captious nor impertinent. If we have the right—which the Wesleyan certainly will not deny—of declaring the old church pro-slavery, because she refuses to treat that as a sin which we show to be so, when tried by the precepts and commands of the religion she professes, surely we have the same right to try the new church by the same standard, when she lays it down in so many words, as a fundamental doctrine, that Slavery is a sin. The members of the old church may plead ignorance in their favor. The members of the new, if they do not carry out their principles to their utmost application possible, are the more guilty, inasmuch as they sin wilfully.

The third position of the Wesleyan has been sufficiently answered in what has been already said. Suffice it to say, further, that if John Wesley's saying be true, that Slavery is "the sum of all villainies," that church which supports it is not a Christian church. The Wesleyans left the old church because it supports Slavery, and therefore is not a Christian church. In receiving letters from it now as a Christian church, they act contrary to their own acknowledged principles of right, and give fellowship to Antichrist. A member coming to them, then, from the old church should be received as one coming from the heathen. I do not see how any other conclusion can be drawn. If it is a severe one, they must lay the blame upon their own principles and their own position, and not my reasoning.

In closing, the Wesleyan says:

Our creed is Anti-Slavery, our professions are Anti-Slavery, and we have published, AND WE HEREBY PUBLISH TO THE WORLD THAT WE WANT NONE TO JOIN OUR CHURCHES BUT ANTI-SLAVERY PERSONS, who are such in soul and body, heart and life, outside and inside, and if, with all this, we are to be classed among the "Brotherhood of Thieves," we will submit to it. We did not begin, or make any allusion to the Standard, and why he is so anxious to make out that we are pro-slavery, we leave him and the public to determine.

I am glad, for one, whatever our contemporary may think, to see this announication, and hope to see that it may be consistently maintained. Who began the controversy, it matters little, so that in the course of it any truth has been brought to light.—G.

A Question Answered.

The Standard asks us if the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions and the Board of the American Baptist Home Mission Society "are the representatives of the same church or of different churches?" We answer that neither of them is the representative of a church or churches, properly speaking. They only represent those persons who pay their money, either for themselves or others, to become members of the Baptist General Convention or of the Home Mission Society. Some Baptists are members of one who are not members of the other. Some are members of both, whilst a very large number of Baptists have no connection with either. An individual church may have one or more delegates in the Convention if it chooses to pay $100 per annum for each seat it occupies in that body. But the Convention and the Home Mission Society are entirely distinct the one from the other, nor do the churches, as such, have the slightest control over either of them, nor do they have any control over the churches. It seems very difficult for persons out of the Baptist denomination to understand that each church is entirely independent of all other churches and all associations, conventions, or societies whatsoever. But such is the fact, and Baptist churches in the same city may or may not be in fellowship, and there is no tribunal on earth to settle the disagreement unless by mutual consent they allow it to be submitted to a third party. In all our missionary operations we have gone on without any regard to church action, and done our work by voluntary associations; for doing which some have actually been turned out of their churches, as there are many Baptist churches that are anti-missionary, and others that are so only in part. We unite with the Home Mission Society or with the Foreign Mission Convention just as we might join a Temperance Society, a Colonization Society, or an Anti-Slavery Society, and the church of which we are members may or may not have any cognizance of it.

The answer of the Transcript is satisfactory as far as it goes. But if I understand it aright, though neither the Convention, nor the Society represents the church as a body, yet both, emanating from the church, and composed entirely of Baptists, are, to a certain extent, the representatives of the character of the church. My second question then,—which the Transcript passes by in silence—is still pertinent. I should be glad to know, and it is a question for Baptists to answer, *as Baptists*, why there is an "apparent distinction in principle" between these two missionary bodies? Why, is the Home Missionary Board pro-slavery, and the Foreign, anti-slavery? If those persons who are "members of both" have felt it their duty to take anti-slavery ground in the one, why have they not also in the other? Or have they obeyed the dictates of conscience where it was easy to do so, and listened to the prompting of interest where it was hard to obey conscience? Explanation is still needed, and in the meantime we must judge of the character of the church by the sum of its influences.

The Transcript thinks it difficult for "persons out of the Baptist denomination" to understand the independent character of each individual church. It is not the first time that I have heard it explained, and insisted upon, and the fact stated to show that no charge of pro-slavery character can be brought against the Church as a whole. It seems to me to be a very flimsy sophism. We know that no one church says to another you shall do or be a certain thing. But we know that every Baptist church in the land says to every other church we will give to you the right hand of fellowship only so far forth as you are Baptist. This they have a perfect right to do, and we have also the right to test them by their own principles. Christianity is of more consequence than Baptistry. Do you say to every antichristian (pro-slavery) church, we will not extend to you Christian fellowship? They do not do this; and as they are bound together in one chain, and each is in fellowship, directly or indirectly, with pro-slavery churches, they are as a whole pro slavery and therefore antichristian.—G.

Arrangements for the Annual Meeting.

Of course everybody understands that the first meeting is to be held in the Tabernacle, on Tuesday morning next, commencing at 10 o'clock. Our friends from a distance will be here in good season, as those from the South will arrive the evening previous, and those from the East, either at the same time, or early in the morning of Tuesday. All residing near the city, it is hoped will be here early enough to be punctual at the hour appointed, that there may be no delay in proceeding at once to business. Our time for that meeting is limited, as the Tabernacle is engaged for the afternoon to another society, which will wish to come into it at their appointed time. It is expected that addresses will be made by W. L. Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Frederick Douglass, Abby Kelley, and others, to hear whom, is in itself worth a long journey.

From the Tabernacle the Society will adjourn to the Minerva Rooms—late Concert Hall—No. 406 Broadway, where the meetings, for the afternoon of Tuesday, and the whole of the two following days will be held.

So far as it is possible to do so, in the uncertainty as to the number of persons from abroad, who will be present, arrangements have been made for their accommodation. If on the arrival of such friends as are not already provided with homes in the city, they will call at this office, they will be directed to comfortable and convenient boarding-houses. Those residing in the city, and who are able and desirous of extending their hospitalities to those from abroad, are requested to leave their names, and the street, and the number of their residences, at this office in the course of this week.

I anticipate a very large meeting. The notices will be widely spread through the city, and no doubt crowds will flock to hear expounded the meaning of this new doctrine of "No Union with Slaveholders." So far as I can learn, too, a more than usually large number is coming from other States. Nobody should stay away who can get here, and all such who do, will no doubt regret it when the report from the meeting reaches them.

Slavery.

The communication under this head was sent me in pamphlet form, with a request that it be published in the Standard. I readily comply with the request that our readers may see what sort of an argument Northern pro-slavery piety can bring forth in favor of continuance in acknowledged sin. The paper needs no reply whatever. The writer, as he goes along, refutes every one of his own positions completely. The ingenious reasoning whereby he shows that the immediate abolition of a system, which violates every single injunction of the Decalogue would be wrong, because such abolition might possibly, as an incidental consequence, violate *one* of the commandments, is a good specimen of the logic of the whole article.

I beg leave to correct one assertion of Mr. Smith. He says: "If the Patriarch Abraham was (were) now living, he could not be admitted to a Christian communion table." If he should be denied, it would not be because of his "illicit connection with his bond-women or slaves." Mr. Smith should know that in this particular the Southern Patriarchs are the true followers of those of old time, and yet are received into Christian fellowship, with here and there an exception, all over the land. Adultery and fornication is held to be no stain on the Christian character in the United States. Abraham would be admitted to very few communion-tables among us, it is true, not because he was a slaveholder, however, but because he was of dark complexion. For the same reason a place would be denied there also to Moses, or any of the old prophets, and even to Jesus and any of his apostles. The color of the skin, in our day, is of far more consequence than the color of the soul.

Later from England.

By the steamship Caledonia, which arrived at Boston on Monday of last week, Liverpool and London dates have been received seven days later than the accounts published in our last paper. There is, however, no news of interest, except the debates in the British Parliament on questions arising out of relations between Great Britain and this country. A sketch of these will be found on our first page. They have excited much war-talk in our city papers, but there is apparently no immediate danger of a rupture, whatever may be the final issue of the Oregon question. The bubble, national honor, will lure men to almost any madness, but it is to be hoped that there is too much common sense in the people both of this country and Great Britain to sacrifice the peace of nations, and shed the blood of thousands on such a question as this.

This Week's Paper.

First Page.—*Pro-Slavery:* "The Brotherhood of Thieves." Slavery. *Selections:* Important Debate on Oregon, and Opinions of the Press. Favorable from Antigua. American Slavery and British Unitarians.

Fourth Page.—*Poetry:* The People have not Bread. The May Queen. A Christmas Carol. *Miscellany:* Review of the Memoir of the Princess Daschkaw. The Aldine Editions. The Finery of War. Dog-Annexation. Leibig, when a boy.

Second Page.—*Selections:* Covenanters and Slavery. Sympathy of English Philanthropists. Haytien Correspondence. *Communications:* Slavery.

Convention for the Abolition of the Death Punishment.—I would remind our friends again that this Convention is to be held on Monday next. It will no doubt be an interesting meeting. Those who cannot reach here in time for the day sessions, can, by leaving home a few hours earlier, be present in the evening. Some little effort should be made to be present at a meeting so important, for a cause so much needing a helping hand, especially here.

☞ I owe an apology to the author of the lines entitled, "The People have not Bread," that they have not appeared sooner. They were accidently overlooked. If he will permit us to hear from him again, he shall not be so neglected.

☞ We are indebted to the kindness of R. D. Webb, Wm. Smeal, and friends unknown, for foreign papers.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

From the New Orleans Bulletin, 14th instant.

Three Days Later from Mexico.

The steamship Alabama, Capt. Windle, arrived yesterday afternoon, from Havana, with papers to the 10th instant. We do not find in them any local news. They contain, however, three days later intelligence from Mexico, brought by the English packet from Vera Cruz. The correspondence of the Diario de la Marina, bearing date at Vera Cruz, the 2d of the present month, corroborate the rumors and suspicions attached to the sailing of the Eurydice from that port to Galveston, and canvasses at some length the opinions of the press in the city of Mexico, on the subject of Annexation. On this topic, we are sorry to observe, the equilibrium of temper and sagacity usually displayed by *el Siglo Diez y Nueve*, is at fault. This paper, we recollect, during the correspondence of the French Minister with the Mexican Government on the subject of the executions at Tobasco, had the good sense and discretion to advise the Administration to conciliate the French, and pointed out the lamentable disasters which would result from another war with France. It has taken a different view, it seems, however, of a war with the United States. The proprietor of the Journal (Sr. D. Ignacio Cumplido,) who is also a member of the House of Representatives, assisted at a secret session of the House, where it was proposed to close immediately all communication with the United States; to prohibit the introduction of her cotton and manufactures, and issue letters of marque. The proposition, however, was not definitely acted on; and no steps appear to have been taken beyond sending protests to the representatives of England and France, and an address to the Governors of Departments, advising them to be prepared for whatever emergency might arise.

The *Siglo* consoles itself with the idea that Texas may not accept the resolution, as the brunt of "the war," it concludes, must inevitably be borne by her on her Western frontier, coupled with an idea that President Jones is inimical to the project.

Farther from Mexico.—The Christoval Colon, which arrived from Havana on Friday, brought the following despatch addressed by the Mexican Executive on the subject of Annexation, to the Governors of the Departments throughout that Republic. It appeared in the Herald of Saturday morning:

Mexico, 22d March, 1845.

The Supreme Government has received official notice of the approval of the Congress of the United States of America, of the Annexation of Texas to their Union, on the terms which are expressed, in the communication of Don Juan M. Almonte, a copy of which you will find in one of the Journals accompanying this.

The Houses of Legislation and the Supreme Government are at present occupied in the consideration of this serious affair, and take this method of informing you of the means they are adopting in relation to it. And in order to insure perfect co-operation, we have to inform you that his Excellency, the President, depends upon the well-known patriotism of yourself, and the assistance of all the inhabitants of your department, and that the good feeling heretofore existing between them and the Government, may be more particularly sustained at this moment when it is so necessary to maintain the rights and fair name of the nation.

(Signed) CUEVAS.

To His Excellency, Governor of the Department of——.

The Herald has also the following letter from Vera Cruz:

Vera Cruz, 2d April, 1845.

The national feeling is daily increasing against the United States. On the 28th ultimo, the Governor sent the American Minister a note, signifying to him, that the relations between the two countries, were stopped at present on account of the acts of the American Government. The general cry is for war, but they are like the Council of rats that were puzzled to know who should hang the bell to the cat's neck. I think they would be very glad to acknowledge Texas as independent, provided she would agree to remain an independent people or Republic.

A Frenchman, named Ribo, who has been in the Mexican service, and holds the title of a captain of a frigate—the same person who fought a duel in New Orleans with Sentmenat—arrived here lately, and went to Mexico. He endeavored to get up a revolution in favor of Santa Anna, with the help of some other officers. Their cry was "*Viva* Santa Anna and the Federal Government; but the volunteers turned out immediately, and made the leaders prisoners.

The depositions of Santa Anna are finished and sent to Mexico. It now remains to decide upon his sentence.

From the New Orleans Picayune of April 17.

Later from Mexico.

We received yesterday, by the brig Guadalete, advices two days later from Vera Cruz, whence she sailed on the 4th instant. The first things which met our eye upon a glance at our Mexican files, were the letter of Senor Cuevas to Mr. Shannon, and the circular addressed to the Ministers of Spain, France, and England, of which we have heretofore made mention, and of which we now give translations:

To his Excellency Wilson Shannon, *Envoy Extraordinary, &c. &c.*

National Palace, Mexico, March 28, 1845.

The undersigned, Minister of Foreign Relations, in addressing himself, for the last time, to his Excellency, Mr. Wilson Shannon, Minister Plenipotentiary from the United States, desires to inform him, that as both houses of the United States Congress have sanctioned the law in relation to the annexation of Texas to the territory of the United States, and as the Minister from Mexico has withdrawn from his mission at Washington, and protested against the act of Congress and the Government of the United States, diplomatic relations between the two countries cannot be continued.

What can the undersigned add to what has already been said by his Government, upon the grave offence offered Mexico by the United States, usurping a portion of Mexican territory, and violating the terms of treaties of friendship, which the Republic of Mexico has observed on her part as long as her honor and the desire to avoid a rupture with the United States have permitted? Nothing more than to lament that two nations, free and republican, contiguous [vecinos] and worthy of a fraternal union, founded upon mutual interests and a common and honorable loyalty, should have cut short their friendly relations, and by an act as offensive to Mexico as it is derogatory to the honor of the American Union.

The undersigned renews to his Excellency, Mr. Shannon, the protest already directed against Annexation; and moreover would add, that the Mexican Republic will oppose the measure with all the decision due to her own honor and sovereignty, and that the Government ardently desire that considerations of loyalty and justice should outweigh with the citizens of the United States, designs for extending their territory at the expense of a friendly Republic, which in the midst of its misfortunes [disgracias] seeks to preserve an unspotted name, and thereby the rank to which its destinies call it.

The undersigned has the honor to offer to his Excellency, Mr. Shannon, his personal respect, and to assure him of his very distinguished consideration.

LUIS G. CUEVAS.

The general circular is as follows:

The undersigned, Minister of Foreign Relations, has the honor to transmit to his Excellency, the Minister of....., the following circular, being impelled to employ this means of transmitting to his [your] Government, in this note, the solemn and formal protest of the Mexican Republic suggested by an act which, wounding to the last degree the rights and honor of Mexico, is equally destructive to the universal principles of justice, to the respect due free and intelligent nations, and the good faith which civilization has fixed as the basis of internal intercourse [internacional politica.] His Excellency, Senor ....., will understand that the undersigned has reference to the law passed by the Congress of the United States, and sanctioned by the Executive, for the annexation of the Department of Texas to the American Union.

To present, in all its deformity, this act of the Congress and Government of the United States, the alarming consequences of its conduct towards the Mexican Republic, would be a useless labor, inasmuch as this note is addressed to the representatives of a nation as illustrious as it is powerful, which, sustaining nobly the rank which it occupies in the world, respects the laws of comity [buena amistad] between foreign nations, and founds its glory upon the immutable titles of morality and justice. The Government of the undersigned has no occasion to exhibit all the grounds upon which it relies for its resistance of this measure of Annexation, as they are obvious and known to all, and as the feeling excited among friendly nations, and even those which have no official relations with Mexico, will be profound upon learning of a measure so injurious and offensive to Mexico, and so utterly unworthy the honor [buen nombre] of the United States.

But the undersigned will take occasion to observe to his Excellency, Senor ——, that the American Government having been the first to acknowledge the independence of the Republic of Mexico, showing itself a zealous partisan of liberty, has been the only one which has endeavored to usurp a portion of her territory. He would also add, that, as it appears from recent declarations, the designs of the United States have been as old as the friendship, which it was sought to confirm—first, by a treaty of amity, and by another for the adjustment of boundaries—which has now been completely violated. In aiding Texas to sever herself from the Republic, the United States were wanting in good faith; but in aiding to incorporate Texas with the American Confederation, and declaring that this has been her policy for twenty years, she has pursued a course which has no parellel in the history of civilized nations.

Mexico, to avoid differences which for the most part had no foundation in justice, [as against her,] has submitted to serious compromises; she has overlooked provocations and injuries, and has preserved her loyalty with such fidelity as to give her more right—if the right she possesses can be increased—to speak out and protest, as the undersigned now does, against the annexation of Texas to the United States, and against all its consequences. The Mexican Republic will employ in opposition to this measure, her power and her resources, and, trusting in the justice of her cause, does not fear to give assurance, that whatever may be the result, she will preserve the honor which at any cost she ought to defend in the very grave matter under consideration.

With this view, the undersigned requests his Excellency, Senor ——, to give this protest its proper direction, and at the same time to accept the assurances of his most distinguished consideration. LUIS G. CUEFAS.

This circular was communicated to their Excellencies, the Ministers Plenipotentiary of England, France, and Spain.

Apart from the above letter and circular, which we have deemed of sufficient interest to give them entire, our files contain little that has not been before known here.

The Siglo gives no credence to the rumors of another revolution, which have obtained currency in Mexico as well as in this country. These reports it attributes to the orders of Government despatching certain military chieftains to the different Departments.

We have seen nothing new respecting Santa Anna.

It does not appear from the tenor of the official communications what will be the nature of the resistance Mexico will make to Annexation. Senor Cuevas' letters propose nothing definite.

Still Later.

By the Picayune of the 20th ultimo, we have news from Mexico one week later than that above. The amount of it is contained in the following paragraph from the Picayune:

"*Mexico has NOT declared war against the United States:* but the official paper *El Diario del Gobierno*, of the 3d instant, announces that it is in possession of certain movements on the part of the Government of a war-like character, which it is constrained to withhold from the public, as *secrecy is the soul of military operations;* but that journal adds that it trusts that the *speedy and successful issue of these operations* will soon relieve the public curiosity in regard to them."

The papers of the capital and of Vera Cruz are said to be occupied with the Annexation question. Some correspondence has taken place between the extraordinary Wilson Shannon and the Mexican Minister of Foreign Relations, for which we have not room in this week's paper.

From the New Orleans Bee, April 14th.

From Texas.

By the arrival of the steam packet New-York, we have received our files of the Galveston papers to the 9th instant. They contain little news and are mainly occupied with the subject of Annexation. The Galveston *Daily News* discusses at some length the mode in which the people of Texas can constitutionally act upon the joint resolutions. On the one hand, it has been said that President Jones has no constitutional power to entertain propositions which go to the overthrow of the present Government; and on the other, that there is no provision in the laws or Constitution empowering the Executive or Congress to call a Convention of the people. Under these circumstances the editor suggests, that the people themselves form a Convention and proceed to draft a State Constitution, in conformity with the article in the present fundamental law of Texas, conferring upon them "an inalienable right at all times to alter the Government as they may think proper."

Meetings in favor of Annexation continue to be held. One at San Augustine was a large gathering, and was attended by the Vice President of Texas, Gen. Henderson, Maj. Kaufman, and other leading men of the country. In Nacogdoches, out of nine hundred voters, it is stated that there are not twenty opposed to the measure.

Much anxiety is experienced to ascertain the opinion of Gen. Houston in regard to the Annexation law. The Galveston News says that he is bending under the whirlpool of popular opinion, which is speaking with a voice of thunder around him. He does not oppose the measure, and his non-committal course has induced his friends to declare positively, that he is now in favor of it.

The Picayune, in an extra of the 14th ultimo, gives the following letter:

Houston, April 8, 1845.

Editors of the Picayune: Presuming that, having disposed of the Annexation question in your country, you naturally look with some interest to the movements in this quarter in reference to it, I drop you a line to say that no official act on the part of our Government has yet transpired in regard to it, unless it be that the President (it is so rumored) has ordered writs of election for Members of Congress, to fill vacant districts—with a view to calling that body together about the 1st of June.

The receipt of the news of the Annexation Resolutions by the United States Congress, took the British and French Ministers here by surprise, and on the arrival of a British man-of-war at Galveston, a few days afterwards, with despatches to the former, both these functionaries immediately repaired to the seat of Government, for the purpose, as it is understood, of asking of our Government a postponement of any action on its part, in reference to the consummation of Annexation, until their Governments could be heard from, and having, as it is understood, obtained a pledge of some sort to that effect, they put about and returned to Galveston, there to await the arrival of farther despatches. Major Donelson met them on his way up, between here and Washington—they being on their way to this place—and when he got there, the *Government were absent*—President and Cabinet having found it convenient to have business in the country just at that time. This may be considered ominous of the feeling of the party in power towards Annexation. They are evidently in no hurry, and there is no telling what inducements may be offered within the next sixty days to remain independent.

In haste, yours truly, E. J. W.

The Picayune adds the following:

"We have two private letters before us, a day later than that published above, and which were written at the latest hour to be in readiness for the steamer, from which we learn that President Jones had returned to Washington, and that the United States Minister, Major Donelson, *had been treated so cavalierly by him and his Cabinet, that he spoke of withdrawing from the seat of Government to Galveston.* This intelligence is from sources so direct as to leave no room to doubt its accuracy From all we learn we are constrained to believe, that if a rupture with Major Donelson would assist in procrastinating action with the acquiesence of the people, President Jones would edify the nations with another *exequatur* proclamation. It is very evident that the interests of the people of Texas have become a minor consideration to the interests of some of her officials; and our suspicions mislead us, if the inquiry for the present is not, what will certain individuals gain by accepting or rejecting Annexation?—the great concerns of the State being left out of consideration in deciding a personal issue of so momentous a character.

"It seems to be agreed that proclamations have been issued to fill vacancies in Congress, so as to amuse the citizens with a few elections. None has been issued convening Congress—nor will there be, we apprehend, until there is a general rising of the country."

Hayti.

Schooner Navarro, left Miragoane, April 12th. Capt. Fuller informs us that there was a great excitement when he left, caused by a plot attempted by ex-President Rivera and his followers, the mulattoes, to raise a revolt in the Island. Providentially for the country, the secret correspondence was discovered before he landed, and a large number were arrested with letters about them; some were shot, others are in prison awaiting trial. A short time before he left, Rivera attempted to land at a small town near Jeremie, but was warned off by his friends. On the 10th, news came of his appearance off Jacmel under foreign colors.

After receiving a pilot he went away with him. A publication from Government was read offering $10.000 reward for the head of Rivera. The *Garde Nationale* was called out armed and equipped for war, and at the beat of the drum was to assemble before the Commandant, and any that were absent would be considered as favorable to Rivera, and would be treated accordingly. Forces are stationed on the fort and all prominent places. An embargo was put on all Haytien vessels on the 3d, in this and all other places in the southern department of the Island. If Rivera should land, the blacks are determined to rise and kill all the mulattoes. They threaten to destroy the whole of the mixed blood population, which is quite numerous. The Government were sending out vessels when we left in all directions, full of armed men. We passed a number as we left the Island. Business very dull. Coffee scarce, and market well stocked with all kinds of American produce.

Later from Hayti.—We learn from Capt. Wilson, of the brig Republic, who arrived this morning from Port Republican, whence he sailed on the 14th, that Herard was reported to have sailed from Jamaica on the 19th of March; that his vessel, a schooner, hae been seen near the coast of Hayti, and that there had been an engagement between it and a gun boat. President Guerriere had proclaimed martial law, and stationed guards all along the coast. Soldiers were patrolling the streets of port Republican, and forcibly enlisting all who could bear arms.

Business was at a stand. No Coffee in the market, owing to the want of men to bring it in from the plantations. American produce abundant.

President Guerriere had caused a number of suspected persons to be arrested and shot.

Capt. Wilson adds that ex-President Boyer had made a demand on the Haytien Government for all his property. It was thought at Port Republican that he was assisting ex-President Herard.—*Com. Adv.*

Acknowledgments.

For the Standard—from April 5th, to May 1st. 1845.

Eastern Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society,	$3 12
Henry Seymour, Seneca Falls, N. Y.	2 00
Samuel Leggett, Whitestone, L. I.	4 00
Gen. Fessenden, Portland, Me.	3 50
Joseph Jones, Penn Yan, N. Y.	7 50
Charles Howland, Buffalo, "	2 00
Isaiah Key, W. Henrietta, "	4 00
Upham & Kendall, Westminister, Mass.	3 00
Buttrick & Co. Lowell, "	2 00
Aaron C. Macy, Hudson, N. Y.	2 00
Wm. H Seward, Auburn, "	4 00
Jno. Wyne, Poughkeepsie, "	6 00
Amasa Southwick, Leicester, Mass.	2 00
D. S. Aldrich, Palmyra, N. Y.	1 00
A. Hanna, Utica, "	2 00
H. M. Daggitt, North Attleboro' Mass.	3 20
B. W. Henshaw, " " "	1 58
P. A. Borden, " " "	1 58
Nathan Hancock, " " "	1 00
Thomas Cheethim, " " "	1 00
Thadeus Edwards, Skaneateles, N. Y.	3 20
S. Galbreath, New Lisbon, Ohio,	4 50
J. Washington Taylor, Cherry Valley, N. Y.	1 00
Asea Williams, Richmond, Ind.	3 00
C. Atkinson, Marion, "	3 00
Abby L. Sutton, Pines Bridge, P. O., N. Y.	2 00
Gerrit Smith, Peterboro' N. Y.	4 00
Mrs. Goodwin, Boston, Mass.	2 00
Cyrus Pierce, W. Newton, "	2 00
Chas. Routh, Boston, "	4 00
L. Munroe, Plainfield, Ct.	2 00
Isaac Smith, Leominster, Mass.	3 00
Wm. Boynton, New Ipswich, N. H.	2 00
Laura Turner, Bridgewater, N. Y.	2 00
Seth Boswell, Farmington, "	3 00
Capt. Reuben Ray, Nantucket, Mass.	2 00
Joseph Trevor, Hamilton, N. Y.	2 00
Horace Duncan, Lyman, N. H.	3 00
Jas. A. Burr, Ludlowville, N. Y.	2 00
Wm. Anthony, Union Springs, "	3 00
Dr. Reed, R chester, "	2 00
Wm. R. Hallowell, " "	2 25
Isaac Gibbs, " "	2 00
Sam'l Green, W. Winfield, "	2 00
Mrs. M. D. Mallory, Woodbury, Ct.	2 00
	—— 119.43
Donations.	
Joseph Carpenter, Executor, New Rochelle, N. Y.	333 59
Laura Turner, Bridgewater, N. Y.	1 00
J. L. Kellogg, " "	1 00
E. M. Mosley, " "	50
Charles Routh, Boston, Mass.	1 00
Thomas Davis, Providence, R. I. balance of pledge,	12 00
George W. A. Babcock, Berlin, Mass.	20 00
	—— 369 09
Total amount,	$488 52

FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer.

Correction.—Mrs. Nancy Babcock, *Boston*, in Standard of April 3d, should have been *Berlin*.

NOTICES.

A stated meeting of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society will be held at Sarah Douglass's school-room, on Thursday, May 8th, at 4 o'clock, P. M.

PHEBE EARLE, Sec.

TO THE ABOLITIONISTS OF EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA.

Are you ready, dear friends, to commence with us preparations for the Pennsylvania Fair of 1845? Warm hearts and active hands we would enlist, at this early period, that no time may be lost which might be profitably spent in this service. Information respecting what is to be done, it can scarcely be necessary to offer to those who, year by year, have been laboring side by side with us in this department of Anti-Slavery toil, and whose skill and ingenuity have been again and again proved. We want whatever liberal souls will devise, and ready hands execute. The Committee commence their efforts this year with the hope of making the Fair superior to those of preceding years, but this hope cannot, of course, be realized, without your dilligent and hearty co-operation. On this we rely. Need we urge upon you motives to action? The slave has found no respite from his sufferings, shall we seek respite from our labors in his behalf? Trusting that you are as ready for this work as ourselves, we suggest that you should immediately begin to inquire what you can give or do for this purpose, and how you can best enlist the services of your friends and neighbors. Will some active friends of the cause take measures for forming sewing circles in their neighborhoods, where articles may be manufactured, donations deposited, and interest excited for the Fair? From such a measure, much benefit, beside pecuniary emolument, results to the Anti-Slavery cause. Will not the friends of the cause in Chester, Bucks, and other counties, adopt this plan, and furnish tables, to be superintended by themselves at the Fair? And will not those who cannot conveniently unite with these circles, be diligent and faithful in individual effort? Of all the friends of the slave in city and country, we ask aid. Of the merchant, we ask contributions of merchandise, of the mechanic, the fruit of his handiwork; of the farmer, the produce of his garden, fields, and poultry-yard. But we ask of all *only* the products of *free* and *requited* labor.

Let us, dear friends, commence our efforts with a determination that our next Fair shall yield great and good results to our cause, and *it will do so.*

Contributions may be sent to any member of the Committee, or to J. M. McKim, No. 31 North Fifth street, Philad

Poetry.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

THE PEOPLE HAVE NOT BREAD.

A wide and fertile world is ours,
A world where every rood,
Obedient to the Maker's word,
Yieldeth his creature food.
Unnumbered fields with yellow grain
And mellow fruit are spread:
God gives enough for all—and yet
The people have not bread.

The ocean swarms with food for man,
The rivers, like a hand,
Its teeming fulness bear into
The bosom of the land.
And petty streams, that veinlike through
The mighty inland thread,
Yield up their finny stores—and yet
The people have not bread.

Earth, ocean, rivers, ev'n the air,
Their riches freely yield;
The granaries groan, yet ripened grain
Lies trodden in the field.
The rich man smiles and counts his gains;
The horses sleek are fed:
God gives enough for all—and yet
The people have not bread.

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 21, 1845.

THE MAY QUEEN.

BY ALFRED TENNYSON.

I.

You must wake and call me early, call me early, mother dear;
To-morrow 'ill be the happiest time of all the glad New-year;
Of all the glad New-year, mother, the maddest, merriest day;
For I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

II.

There's many a black black eye, they say, but none so bright as mine;
There's Margaret and Mary, there's Kate and Caroline:
But none so fair as little Alice, in all the land they say,
So I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

III.

I sleep so sound all night, mother, that I shall never wake,
If you do not call me loud, when the day begins to break:
But I must gather knots of flowers, and buds, and garlands gay,
For I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

IV.

As I came up the valley, whom think ye I should see,
But Robert leaning on the bridge, beneath the hazel tree?
He thought of that sharp look, mother, I gave him yesterday—
But I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

V.

He thought I was a ghost, mother, for I was all in white,
And I ran by him without speaking, like a flash of light.
They call me cruel-hearted, but I care not what they say,
For I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

VI.

They say he's dying all for love, but that can never be:
They say his heart is breaking, mother—what is that to me?
There's many a bolder lad 'ill woo me any summer day,
And I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

VII.

Little Effie shall go with me to-morrow to the green,
And you'll be there too, mother, to see me made the Queen;
For the shepherd lads on every side 'ill come from far away,
And I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

VIII.

The huneysuckle round the porch, has wov'n its wavy bowers,
And by the meadow-trenches blow the faint, sweet cuckoo-flowers;
And the wild marsh-marigold shines like fire in swamps and hollows gray,
And I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

IX.

The night winds come and go, mother, upon the meadow-grass,
And the happy stars above them seem to brighten as they pass;
There will not be a drop of rain the whole of the live-long day,
And I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

X.

All the valley, mother, 'ill be fresh and green and still,
And the cowslip and the crowfoot are over all the hill,
And the rivulet in the flowery dale 'ill merrily glance and play,
For I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

XI.

So you must wake and call me early, call me early, mother dear,
To-morrow 'ill be the happiest time of all the glad New-year;
To-morrow 'ill be, of all the year, the maddest, merriest day,
For I'm to be Queen o' the May, mother, I'm to be Queen o' the May.

From Punch.

A CHRISTMAS CAROL.

To church betimes! The Christmas chimes
Are calling high and low in;
To church then, all, both great and small!
[Chorus of many voices,
We've not a coat to go in!

Like our old sires, with roaring fires,
The fangs of winter braving;
Huge logs pile high, to sit thereby.
[Chorus,
We've not a single shaving!

Good Christmas fare is physic rare
To warm the regions inner;
Plum pudding join to stout sirloin.
[Chorus,
We've not a crust for dinner!

Fill glass and bowl, each jovial soul,
As round the hearth we close in;
Our wine is bright in its ruddy light.
[Chorus,
Our very water's frozen!

Right late we'll sup, and keep it up
Till time to morn shall creep on;
Then sink to rest in downy nest.
[Chorus,
We've not a bed to sleep on!

Loud be the song, the laughter long;
Our joy no care shall leaven;
Christmas is here but once a year.
[Chorus,
For that, at least, thank heaven!

Miscellany.

MISCELLANY.

MEMOIRS OF THE PRINCESS DASCHKAW, *Lady of Honor to Catherine II. Empress of all the Russias: written by herself: comprising letters of the Empress, and other Correspondence.* Edited from the originals, by MRS. W. BRADFORD, LONDON, HENRY COLBURN, 1840.

Most of the books of this nineteenth century, seem, like Peter Pindar's razors, to have been made merely to sell. Especially is this the case in America. Few, except those works which, like the wine-merchant's ordinary wares, have been through so many processes of admixture, as to have lost all taste of the soil, can even be republished here. Of course this gives but little encouragement to the productions of native merit. It strikes Englishmen with astonishment, that for the most part only trashy novels, which fall dead from the press in Great Britain, or such sectarian selections as have a whole denomination to depend upon, can secure a remunerating sale in the United States.

The book, whose title is placed at the head of this column, is of altogether another sort, and so has not warranted republication. It is a real unadulterated book, of a very interesting character. The autobiography of a great soul, that was also in its day a great personage, and a very sincere soul to boot, could hardly fail to be of a higher order than the vamped-up "lives" and "memoirs" which supply the demands of denominational pride and literary curiosity, and which are generally monuments, either of the writer's incapacity to choose, or incompetency to handle a good subject.

These memoirs will give great pleasure to the lovers of reality and sincerity. The directions of the Princess Daschkaw, that they should not be published till after her death, and the motive which prompted her to write them,—(the wish to oblige a beloved friend,) as well as the internal evidence from their own pages, show a mind free from the meanness of pride and vanity, and only the more admirable from the bursts of its honest self-recognition, and its desire to be rightly appreciated. The Princess has been fortunate in an editor. Mrs. Bradford evidently possessed a mind capable of comprehending her illustrious friend, and unusual opportunities for observation. Her own portion of the work is very interesting. Devotedly attached to the Princess, she is freed by the very truth and strength of her friendship, from the besetting sin of admiring friends, who undertake to illustrate themselves by means of the great luminary they undertake to describe. Mrs. Bradford does not Boswellize, for she is evidently thinking of her friend alone, and not of herself. She impresses us as one discharging a sacred duty to the departed and to the cause of truth. The Princess Daschkaw, as a subject of Russian history, and as a woman of extraordinary powers, had been much misrepresented by contemporaries and by historians; and the editor, whom American Abolitionists, (—— the readers of the Standard,—) will know better as a daughter of that Wilmot family, whose name is illustrated by its connection with West-India Emancipation, determines to vindicate the noble character of her "Russian Mother;" (so the Princess called herself;) and it is with no common emotions of pleasure that we see the warmth of fidelity with which, thirty years after the death of the Princess, this duty is fulfilled. We take some pains to copy from the beautiful English edition, as yet the only one, some interesting passages, that we may share the pleasure which these memoirs have given us with the readers of the Standard, and hastily throw together a few historical preliminaries, in order to refresh their memories for a better appreciation of the extracts.

When, in 1724, Peter the Great died, without having appointed his successor, as so absolute a monarch might, the throne naturally fell to the most able. The laws of succession would have pointed out his daughter, Anna Petrowna, who was married to the Duke of Holstein, or to his grandson, Peter. His son, Alexis, the father of this grandson, had long before come to a violent end, having died in convulsions upon the reading of his sentence of death. Neither the daughter nor the grandson succeeded to the vacant throne—vacant but a few hours—for the army and the Church,—the generals and the bishops, concurred with Prince Menlzokoff, a leading man in the empire, to proclaim Peter's wife, Catherine, as the fitting successor. The tools were to her who could use them—the sceptre to the strongest hand. She reigned gloriously three years, and died in 1727. The grandson, young Peter, then reigned till 1730, and was superceded through a court revolution, by Anna, Duchess Dowager of Comland, a niece of Peter the Great, being the daughter of his elder brother. She died in 1740, and her grand-nephew succeeded, under the title of Iwan (John) III. But Peter the Great left another daughter, Elizabeth, whose character appeared to some able men about the court, strong enough to sustain them if they could effect a revolution in her favor, and the young Iwan was displaced to make room for her, the next year—1741. She died after a glorious reign of twenty years, in 1762, and was quietly succeeded by her nephew, another young Peter, styled the III.; Duke of Holstein, and Grand Duke of Russia; son of *Great* Peter's daughter—Anna Petrowna, who lost her chance to the throne as aforesaid, when her father died in 1724.

This Peter III. was a contemptible and odious character, and was, at the time that Elizabeth died, separated from his wife, the Princess of Anhalt Zerbot. A sudden revolution placed her on the throne in his stead, and it was the planning and successful conduct of this Revolution, at the age of eighteen, which entitled the Princess Daschkaw to the gratitude of Russia, and the admiration of all the nations of Europe; for this Princess was that CATHARINE THE GREAT, whose knowledge and abilities so greatly raised the character of her country, and placed herself in the first class of legislators.

It is interesting to see, as we do in the introductory letter, addressed to her friend, Mrs. Bradford, with what feelings, the Princess, at the age of sixty, looks back upon past events, and to observe that the truth of her character and the warmth of her heart were in nowise impaired by a long and eventful public life. The tedium of copying prevents us from giving this letter. May the omission pique the curiosity of the readers, and so stimulate some American publishing house to reprint these memoirs. We will commence our extracts with a scene between the little princess, the daughter of the illustrious Count Worontzow, the wife of Prince Daschkaw, and already a mother, and the Grand Duchess of Russia, the wife of the stupid Peter, the successor that was to be, of the glorious Elizabeth, the Princess of Anhalt Zerbot, afterwards Catherine the Great.

The Empress's state of health, which had long been declining, gave but little hope, as the ensuing winter approached, that she would have strength to survive it. I shared the grief which most of my family, and especially the Grand Chancellor, felt on this occasion; not only because I loved her majesty, but because, from the scenes I had so lately witnessed at Oranienbaum, I saw how little my country had to hope from the Grand Duke, her successor, sunk as he was in the most degrading ignorance, careless of the happiness of his country, and swayed by no better principle than a vulgar pride in being the creature of the King of Prussia, whom he used to designate amongst his Holstein comrades by the title of "*the King my master.*"

It was announced, about the middle of December, that the Empress would not live many days. At that time I happened to be much indisposed, and had even been confined to my bed; but regardless of any danger excepting such as might affect the Grand Duchess, when the reigning sovereign was no more, I got up on the 20th of the month at midnight, and having wrapped myself in furs, we drove towards the wooden palace on the Moika, where her majesty and the rest of the imperial family were then resident. Alighting from my carriage at some distance from the palace, I walked to a little back vestibule, in that wing of it which was occupied by their imperial highnesses, in hopes of reaching, unperceived, the Grand Duchess's apartments. By a most fortunate accident, which saved me perhaps, from some disastrous mistake, as I knew nothing of this part of the palace, I met the Grand Duchess's first femme-de-chambre, Katherine Ivanovna. Having made myself known, I begged to be immediately conducted to her imperial highness. "She is in bed," was the reply. "It matters not," said I, "the business which brings me is urgent, and I must speak with her to-night." The femme-de-chambre, who knew me well, and my attachment to her mistress, notwithstanding the unseasonableness of the hour, made no further hesitation, but led the way to her apartment. The Grand Duchess, knowing that I was ill, and therefore not likely to expose myself to the cold of such a rigorous night, and the difficulties of gaining admittance into the palace, could scarcely believe her senses when she heard me announced. "For Heaven's sake," exclaimed she, "if she is really here, let her be instantly admitted." I found her, as I entered, in bed; but before I could utter a word, "my dearest Princess," said she, "before you tell me what brings you out at such an extraordinary hour, endeavor to warm yourself; you are indeed too negligent of your health, which is so precious to Prince Daschkaw and myself." She then bade me get into the bed, and having well muffled up my feet, she at length allowed me to speak. "In the present state of things, Madame," said I, "when the Empress has but a few days,—perhaps a very few hours to live, I can no longer endure the idea of that uncertainty in which an approaching event may place your welfare. Is it not possible to make some provision against the impending danger, and to avert those clouds which are ready to burst over your head? In the name of heaven, place your confidence in me; I am worthy of it, and will prove myself still more so. Have you formed any plan, or taken any precaution which may ensure your safety. Deign to give me your orders and direct me."

The Grand Duchess, bathed in tears, pressed my hand against her heart. "I am grateful to you, my dearest Princess," replied she, "beyond all power of expression; and it is with the most perfect confidence and truth that I declare to you I have formed no sort of plan—that I can attempt nothing, and that I believe it only remains for me to meet with courage, whatever may happen. I therefore commit myself to God Almighty, and place my only hope in his protection." "Then, Madame," said I, "your friends must act for you. As to myself, I have zeal enough to inflame them all; and what is the sacrifice, I am not ready to make?" "In the name of Heaven, Princess," said she, "think not of exposing yourself to danger, in hopes of counteracting evils which are, in truth, without a remedy. Were you on my account to draw on yourself misfortunes, that indeed would subject me to everlasting regrets." "All that I can say at present, Madame," replied I, "is, that I will take no step which can endanger your safety; be the peril what it may, let it light on me. Though a blind devotion in your cause lead me to the scaffold, you shall never be its victim." The Grand Duchess would have continued, and was warning me against the inexperience and enthusiasm of my age and character, when, interrupting her, I kissed her hand, and assured her that I would no longer expose either of us to any risk by prolonging this interview. She then cordially embraced me, and after remaining some moments in each other's arms, mutually affected, I rose from the bed, and, leaving her much agitated by what had passed, I hastened with all the courage and strength I had, to retrace the way back to my carriage.

On my return home, I found the Prince, who had only just arrived before me, in the utmost amazement, as may well be conceived, at the absence of his invalid; but when I told him where I had been, and the motive of such a visit; when I repeated the resolution I had seriously taken, of contributing to my country's good by saving the Grand Duchess, he approved and applauded the energy and devotedness I had shown, in terms of the warmest praise, qualified only with those of tender solicitude lest my health on this occasion should be the sacrifice. He had been, that evening, at my father's house, and when he related to me part of a conversation they had held together, which, however guardedly my father spoke, sufficiently showed his sentiments and forebodings on the approaching change to be such as alarmed every patriotic bosom, my satisfaction on this point was complete, and I thought no more of the uneasiness, the fatigue and danger I had just undergone.

The first movements towards the conspiracy, the gaining over of the statesmen and the guards, the promptitude of the Princess, her happy foresight, the success of the enterprise, and the Proclamation of the Grand Duchess as Empress Catherine II. shall appear in our next number.—c.

From the New-York Evening Gazette.

THE ALDINE EDITIONS.

The design of a dolphin twisted round an anchor, with the words "*Ald: Discip: Anglic:*" upon the title page of some of the most beautiful English editions of the poets, classics, &c. and the same design with the words "*Ald: Discip: Americ:*" upon certain of the most perfect specimens which have issued from the American press, having frequently prompted the question "what it means?" without always being satisfactorily answered, we deem it probable that an explanation, as well as some additional information we have compiled relating to this subject, will be acceptable to many of our readers.

In accordance with the custom of printers at the time, to use particular signs by which their works might be immediately recognized, this design of a dolphin and an anchor was the distinguishing mark of the original Aldine press, which, for nearly a century, under the management of the Aldini, father, son, and grandson, maintained its celebrity and superiority over all other presses in the world. It was originally established by Aldus (a diminutive of his babtismal name *Theobaldus*) Pius Minutius, at Venice, where, in 1494, he published his first work. The beauty of his types was unrivalled. He was the inventor of what was then called the Aldine, and has since been styled the *italic* type. It is said that he founded his type in imitation of the handwriting of Petrarch, which was celebrated for its neatness and distinct formation of every letter. Aldus first used this style of type in his edition of Virgil, in 1501, the first book that ever appeared in print in the octavo size. From the former unwieldy size of books, this improvement of Aldus was deemed of the greatest utility, and was heralded throughout the world. Aldus was not only a printer, but he ranked among the first scholars of his age; and, by his publication of the works of Aristotle, he secured the highest praise of his contemporaries, and became entitled to the gratitude of posterity. It is impossible for us to form an adequate idea of the difficulties he encountered in changing the direction of studies from the narrow bounds of monkish legends to the noblest works of Greece and Rome, and of the patience, sagacity, and erudition it required to decipher the manuscripts which formed the basis of his editions, to supply omissions, and to reconcile the various readings which gradually had found their way into, and were incorporated as part and parcel of, the best copies then extant. His labors attracted the attention of the highest dignitaries, then the patrons of letters, and Pope Leo X. rewarded his merit by issuing a bull in 1513, by which he granted to Aldus, for fifteen years, the sole privilege of publishing whatever Greek and Latin books he had already, or might afterwards print, as well as the exclusive use of the Aldine or Italic type. He established a typographical academy, which included among its members the illustrious prodigy of letters, Picus, Prince of Mirandola, Erasmus, Cardinal Bembo, and many of the most distinguished persons of the age. This learned body used to assemble at the house of Aldus to examine manuscripts, to decipher and correct them prior to publication. The inscription over the door of his studio or *sanctum* shows the zeal with which Aldus pursued his avocations. It was in Latin, and this is its translation: "Whoever thou art, Aldus begs and conjures thee that if thou hast occasion to speak to him, thou dost finish in a few words, and go away quickly; unless thou comest, like Hercules, to lend thy shoulders to the weary Atlas. Then thou and all that come here will always find something to do."

He amassed a large fortune, and yet devoted it, his time, and talents, without stint or abatement, until his death, to the revival of letters. Few indeed in this day are aware how much they are indebted to Aldus Pius Minutius for the literary benefits they now enjoy. He married the daughter of Andrea Asculano, also a printer, of Venice, and, after living to an advanced age, died about the year 1513-'14.

He was succeeded by his son Paulus, who inherited both the fortune and talents of his father, and, as a printer and editor, equalled, if not surpassed him. He was passionately devoted to the study of Cicero, and published improved edition after edition of his works. He examined everything which could be found to throw any light upon the productions of Cicero; and to him the world is chiefly indebted for the present complete editions of the speeches, essays, and letters of Rome's great orator. Paulus was also elected Professor of Eloquence to the Venetian Academy, and continued in that city until 1561, when he removed to Rome, and established his printing press in the Capitol. He also had charge of the Vatican Library. He died about 1574, aged 62 years, leaving a son, generally called Aldus junior, or the younger, who early distinguished himself by his precocious talents. Besides editing several works of eminent authors, he published a number of original treatises, commentaries, and volumes of epistles in Latin and Italian. He was also appointed by Clement VIII. to the care of the Library, and to direct the presses of the Vatican.

He was deemed one of the greatest geniuses of the age; and, like too many real and imaginary ones who have existed since, and perhaps before his time, he depended too much upon his talents and genius, without patience and pains-taking labor, and dying, 1597, left his affairs in the greatest disorder. Before his death he was obliged to dispose of a portion of his valuable library to buy bread, and afterward the remainder was sold for the benefit of his creditors. It is said that the library which his father, grandfather, great uncles, and himself had collected, which was once in his possession, contained 80,000 volumes. The family of Pisani, in Italy, now have many of the original volumes of this library, which were chiefly purchased by their ancestor at the time of sale. Thus the press of Aldus ceased to exist, after having flourished for nearly a century.

The neatness of the text, the beauty of the ink, and of the paper of these printers, have rarely been equalled, and perhaps never surpassed. The ink used (which, it is said, chiefly came from Paris) has a lustre and brilliancy which modern ink does not possess. It adds greatly to the beauty of the printed page. Whether the difference between it and modern ink, proceeds from the difference in the preparation, or from the influence of age, time alone can decide.

And now for a more particular explanation of the abbreviated words used in modern times, in connection with the dolphin and the anchor. Whenever an edition issues from the press with real or imaginary pretensions to the title of being a descendant of the Aldine Press, by reason of the beauty of its typography, its proprietor feels at liberty to adopt the Aldine design of a dolphin twisted round an anchor as his coat of arms, with the abbreviated words above mentioned as his motto. The abbreviation stands for the words "Aldi discipulus Anglicanus," or "Americanus," as the case may be; that is "The English (or American) disciple or imitator of Aldus;" or, (if used in the plural number,) of the "Aldini."

From Mrs. Austin's German Prose Writers.

THE HARTZ MINERS.

Quiet and monotonous as the life of these people appears, it is nevertheless a true living life. The aged, palsied woman who sat by the stove, over against the large cupboard, may have sat there a quarter of a century, and her thoughts and feelings have doubtless grown into every corner of this stove, and into every rude carving of this cupboard. And the stove and the cupboard live; for a human being has infused into them a portion of its own soul.

It was this life of contemplation,—of immediate perceptions,—that gave birth to the German *Märchen**, the peculiarity of which consists in this,—that not only animals and plants, but also objects apparently destitute of all life, speak and act. To the thoughtful and simple people in the quiet, contented privacy of their lowly cottages on mountain or in forest, the inward life of such objects revealed itself; they acquired an indelible and consistent character, a charming mixture of fantastic humor and thoroughly human dispositions. And so we see them in the *Märchen*, in which the wildest wonders are told in the easy matter-of-course style of daily occurrences: needles and pins come out of the tailor's shed, and lose themselves in the dark; straws and bits of charcoal try to cross the brook and are cast away; the shovel and the broom stand upon the step and quarrel and fight; the questioned looking-glass shows the face of the prettiest girl, and drops of blood begin to speak mysterious fearful words of anxious pity.

From the same cause is our life in childhood so infinitely significant; at that age everything is of importance to us; we hear everything, see everything, and all our impressions are vivid; whereas at a later age we do everything with design, and we lose in depth what we gain in extension of impressions. Now, we are grown up gentlemen and ladies; we frequently change our dwelling, the housemaid daily clears everything away, and alters at her will the position of the furniture, which has little interest for us, as it is either new, or it belongs to-day to John, to-morrow to Peter; our very clothes are strangers; we hardly know how many buttons there are on the coat upon our back; we change our clothes as often as possible, so that not one of them remains connected with our inward or outward history;—scarcely can we recollect the appearance of that brown waistcoat which once brought so much ridicule upon us, and upon whose broad stripes the dear hand of our beloved rested so kindly.

The old woman by the stove, over against the great cupboard, wore a flowered petticoat of faded stuff, the wedding garment of her mother. Her great grandson, a fair-haired, bright-eyed boy, dressed as a miner, sat at her feet and counted the flowers on her petticoat; and she has most likely told him many a grave and pretty story about this petticoat, which the boy will not soon forget, which will often float before his fancy when, as a full-grown man, he is at his dark and solitary work under ground, and which he will perhaps tell, when the dear old grandmother has been long dead, and he, a silver-haired, feeble old man, sits in the midst of his grandchildren, near the stove, over against the great cupboard.—*Heinrich Heine.* (*Reisebilder.*)

* Popular story. We have not a corresponding word. Fairy tale is too exclusive, since in those here especially mentioned there are no fairies. Story or tale is, on the other hand, too general, for the marvellous is a necessary element of the Märchen.—*Translator.*

From Douglass Jerold's Shilling Magazine.

THE FINERY OF WAR.

"Halt! Attention! Present Arms!" One man speaks the words; as if by mechanism, a thousand men obey him.

Yes: look down the column, that long extending line of red and white, crowned with steel and feathers. Every limb, every muscle moves like limbs and muscles directed by one mind, and yet there are a thousand minds, a thousand wills, a thousand hearts throbbing with manhood's feelings and emotions, yet all curbed, checked, pent-up, giving no outward mark of their presence more than if they were naught, than if the flesh and nerves which clothe them were but so much steel and brass.

It is a great thing to see machinery imitating man—lever and crank aping muscle and sinew—but is it so great a thing to see man imitating machinery; muscle and sinew aping lever and crank?

"Attention!" 'Tis a serried rank—compact, regular as a mathematical diagram. Legs, arms, muskets, sabres, the same movements—every eye glancing, every pulse beating—but as discipline ordains.

Crashing past, with ringing arms and trampling horses, a whirlwind of gaudy trappings, gay plumage, and sparkling steel: a body of cavalry flies past. Their array seems more loose, but 'tis in appearance only. The trumpet is their word of mouth; and not only the men, but the brutes they bestride, can interpret the language. "To the right! to the left! halt! forward!" rings from out the brazen or the silver tube, and the docile steeds and docile men, equally well disciplined, think as little, the one as the other, of the why and the wherefore, but obey—faultlessly, mechanically obey.

And then the loud melody of martial music comes ringing through the air a spirit-moving strain! A march, a triumphal march, in all its cadences, all its bursts of rich harmony; talking of glory, of pomp, and lying while it talks!

Why not interpret martial music aright? It might be done. An ear morally tuned might hear, amid the breath of its melody, mournful wailing, shrieks such as surgeons shrink from when the scalpel is deep in the flesh; the lamentations of despairing men and women muttered lowly; a roaring as of burning homes; and anon, when the strain ceased, a silence like the silence of deserted hearths! * * *

Nothing could be more awkward if, when we looked at a regiment, we saw only a body of slaves, vowed to perform any killing work which might be demanded of them—if the sight merely called up thoughts of unjust wars, men and women dead and dying, cities burning and pillaged, commerce and manufactures checked, civilization itself retarded. This would never do. The system would not be tolerated. We must deck it in borrowed plumes. Fine feathers make fine birds—the eye must entrap the mind. Clothe war, therefore, in gayer colors than peace; make its ministers resplendent in their robes of sacrifice; let the steel which cuts, glitter like valued gems; the evolutions which destroy, be graceful as the motions of dancing girls!

In our review we have all the beauties, the picturesqueness of the real field. The curling smoke wreathes as gracefully from the cannon's mouth as if a mass of iron had sped through its folds; the charge is as beautiful to behold sweeping past—a tempest of men and horses, flags and steel—as if an opposing line were awaiting it, and slaughter and wide-spread death and desolation were the inevitable results of the meeting.

And the spectacle *takes*: it does its duty, it throws dust in our eyes, and we are not unwilling to be thus temporarily blinded. Did we see truly, we should see too well for our own mental comfort. We must have the glossy skin stretched over the bony skeleton; we must have the art and science of killing men glossed over with the fairest appliances.

Look at that man, a sturdy animal, full of health and vigor, and bounding spirits: his eye is bright and his frame sinewy. The one glances from beneath a waving plume, the other swells under rich trappings and gaudy clothing. All the means which can heighten and show off to the best advantage physical symmetry have been expended upon him, and, as he marches by, with proud port and clanking arms, he seems a favored creature, something better than mere ordinary flesh and blood, than common sombre-clad humanity.

But he is bought and sold: he is not his own: his strength, his vigor, his animal spirits, are another's. These muscles must swell and work only when another orders; that eye must only glance to do another's bidding. Chains and fetters, wretchedness and nakedness, are the general badges of servitude, but not the universal marks. Gauds and trinkets, fripperies to take the eye, tinsel to glitter, and rich colors to allure, may equally tell when man is not free. A livery is often a moral chain, a badge often a moral brand. But we must have liveries and badges, not chains and brands, the most pleasing tokens of the dreaded thing.

From the London Punch.

DOG-ANNEXATION.

John Polk was put to the bar charged with robbing the Mexican Minister of a favorite dog, named Texas, the circumstances of the case Don Bernardo Murphy stated to be these:—Some months since, John Polk sold his Excellency the dog, (a very large animal, spotted black and white, that used to run under his carriage,) subsequently a fellow named Houston, a countryman of Polk's, who had been in his Excellency's service, absconded with the dog, and he had that day seen it at Greenwich Fair, whither he had gone in company with Chevalier Bunsen. The animal was tied to a van, belonging to the prisoner, and from which he was haranguing and psalm-singing to the company at the fair.

POLICEMAN, X. 21, said—Please your worship, there has been more picking of pockets round that 'ere psalm-singing wan, than in any part of the fair.

Mr. ABERDEEN—Silence, Policeman. What has that to do with the complaint?

The Mexican Minister continued, in a very agitated manner, "I instantly recognized my dog, and gave the scoundrel yonder in charge of a policeman."

"Scoundrel!" the prisoner cried, (a very sanctimonious looking fellow, who held the dog in his arms,)—"Am I in a Christian land to hear myself called by such names? Are we men? Are we brethren? Have we blessings and privileges, or have we not? I come of a country the most enlightened, the most religious, the most freest, honestest, punctuallest, on this airth, I do."

Mr. ABERDEEN, (with a profound bow,)—You are an American, I suppose?

POLK—I thank a gracious mussy I am! I can appeal to everything that is holy, and, laying my hand on my heart, declare I am an honest man. I scorn the accusation that I stole the complainant's dog. The dog is my dog—mine by the laws of heaven, airth, right, nature, and possession.

DON BERNARDO MURPHY, very much agitated, here cried out—How yours? I can swear to the animal. I bought him of you.

POLK—You did. It's as true as I'm a free-born man.

DON BERNARDO—A man who was an old servant of yours comes into my service and steals the dog.

POLK—A blesseder truth you never told.

DON BERNARDO—And I find the animal now again in your possession.

POLK (cuddling the dog)—Yes, my old dog—yes, my old Texas, it did like to come back to its old master, it did!

DON BERNARDO (in a fury)—I ask your worship, isn't this too monstrous?

Mr. ABERDEEN—Your Excellency will permit me to observe that we have not yet heard Mr. Polk's defence. In a British court, justice must be shown, and no favor.

POLK—I scorn a defence. The dog returned to me by a lor of natur—its wicked to fly against a law of natur. If I sold the dog, and by the irresistible attraction of cohesion, and the eternal order of things, he comes to me—am I to blame? It's monstrous, heinous, regular blasphemy to say so.

Mr. Aberdeen appeared deeply struck by the latter observation.

POLK (continued)—I didn't steal the animal. Steal! Is a man of my character to be called a thief? I annexed him—that's all. Besides, what jurisdiction has this here court? what authority has any court on airth in a question purely American? My bargain with Don Bernardo Murphy took place out of this country—the dog came back to me thousands of miles away herefrom.

Mr. ABERDEEN—In that case I really must dismiss the complaint. Allow me to state my opinion, Mr. Polk, that the dog is yours; I have no business to inquire into questions of Annexation as you call it, or of robbery as his Excellency here, (very rudely, I must think,) entitles your bargain. I entreat rather that gentlemen so respectable should live together in harmony; and—and I wish you both a very good morning.

Mr. Polk then left the office whistling to his dog, and making signs of contempt at Don Bernardo Murphy, who slunk away in a cab. He had not been gone an hour when Policeman X. 21, came into the office and said, "Please your worship, the Yankee annexed your worship's Canadian walking-stick in the passage."

Mr. ABERDEEN (sternly)—Mind your own business, fellow, Mr. Polk is perfectly welcome to the stick.

Presently another member of the force, O'Regan by name, entered and swore the incorrigible Polk had stolen his beaver hat.

Mr. ABERDEEN (good humoredly)—Well, well, I dare say the hat wasn't worth twopence halfpenny; and it's better to lose it than to squabble about it at law.

O'Regan left the Court grumbling, and said it was'n't so in Temple's time.

From the Phrenological Journal.

LIEBIG, WHEN A BOY.

Liebig was distinguished at school as "booby," the only talent then cultivated in German schools being verbal memory. On one occasion, being sneeringly asked by the master what he proposed to become, since he was so bad a scholar, and answering that he would be a chemist, the whole school burst into a laugh of derision. Not long ago, Liebig saw his old schoolmaster, who feelingly lamented his own former blindness. The only boy in the same school who ever disputed with Liebig the station of "booby," was one who never could learn his lesson by heart, but was continually composing music, and writing it down by stealth, in school. The same individual Liebig lately found at Vienna, distinguished as a composer, and conductor for the Imperial Opera House. I think his name is Ruelling. It is to be hoped that a more rational system of school instruction is gaining ground. Can anything be more absurd or detestable than a system which made Walter Scott and Justus Liebig "boobies" at school, and so effectually concealed their natural talents, that, for example, Liebig was often lectured before the whole school on his being sure to cause misery and broken hearts to his parents, while he was all the time conscious, as the above anecdote proves, of the possession of talents similar in kind to those he has since displayed.

Associated Agency.

Central Office, 20 *Wall Street*, (*basement*,) *New-York.*

THE attention of persons who are desirous of improving their condition in life, is respectfully invited to the following great bargains now offered in this office.

864 acres of land with improvements, in Lyonsdale, Lewis Co. N. Y. 40 miles north of Utica, with half of the immense water-power of High Falls, on Black River a large and never-failing stream, with sixty feet fall, with a saw-mill in operation. The whole, or a part will be sold Price for the whole only $12,000.

A farm of 750 acres of the best quality of land in Frederick Co. Virginia, 40 miles from Washington City, in a high state of cultivation, with superior buildings, including stock and farming utensils, for $25,000.

3,000 acres of valuable land in Luzerne Co. Pennsylvania, with improvements, water-power, &c. for $37,500.

A large portion of the Town of Mount Carmel, Wabash Co. Illinois, with extensive tracts of land in the vicinity, including two villages, with Houses, Lots, Ferries Coal-Banks, and an abundance of water-power. Water communication by way of the lakes to New-York, and by the Mississippi to New Orleans.

A part of the town of Toolesborough, Louisa Co. Iowa, on the River Mississippi, with several thousand acres of land adjoining.

8,660 acres of first-rate rolling land in Lincoln Co. Missouri, on the Mississippi. 1,000 acres Prarie, the balance timbered land. Price $5,000.

20,000 acres of excellent farming land, very favorably situated in Hampshire Co. Virginia, at $2 an acre.

40,000 acres of choice selected land in Michigan, at $1 an acre.

2,500 acres of land in West Tennessee, Perry Co. will be sold, a great bargain.

60,000 acres, in Fentriss Co. Tennessee, in tracts varying from 1,000 to 5,000 acres each, of good farming land with Iron, Coal, Saltpetre, Epsom Salts, Copperas, an water-power.

214,000 acres in Washington, Green, Cock, Sevier and Blount counties, Tennessee, at 25 cents an acre. On these lands are Iron, Bituminous Coal, Fine Clay for Pottery, Feldspar, Quartz, Lime, Alum, and an inexhaustible supply of water-power.

Several of the above tracts of land are peculiarly adapted to the settlement of industrial Associations.

Also, for sale in this office, a great variety of Farms, Mills, Houses, Town-Lots, &c. in the different Counties of the States of New-York and New Jersey, and in all the Western States and Territories, at the lowest market prices, and with warranted title.

Having 26 Branch offices in the West, 9 in New England, and 4 in Europe, our Associated Agency offers the greatest facilities to persons wishing to buy, sell, or exchange Real Estate. All such are invited to command our services.

A principal object of the Association is, to put in practical operation a plan, by which persons wishing to purchase Real Estate of any description, may, with the least possible delay, trouble, or expense, be informed where they can find property for sale, adapted to their circumstances and wants; and by which the seller and the buyer may be brought together, to make such transactions as may be mutually beneficial.

We have already a rich Register of property for sale, to which we invite the attention of those who wish to purchase Real Estate of any description, or in any par of the country.

We also conduct an Agency for non-resident proprietors of Western Lands.

Agency for *procuring* and for *selling* Patents in the United States and in Europe.

Agency for receiving orders for Arnold's *Superior* Scythe Sharpening Rifles, Price in New-York, $6 a groce.

Agency for effecting insurance against fire in all parts of the Union.

Agency for sale of the Recipe for the genuine Berlin Hams, superior to Westphalias.

Agency for procuring Loans on Bond and Mortgage.

BUFFUM & Co.
Basement Office, 20 Wall Street
November 28, 1844.—tf.

Graham House, New Arrangement.

ROSWELL GOSS informs his friends and the public, that he has enlarged his Boarding Establishment, known as the

GRAHAM HOUSE, 63 BARCLAY STREET,

by adding to it the adjoining house, and is prepared to accommodate transient or permanent Boarders on the most favorable terms. All friends of Temperance desiring a quiet home, and freedom from the fumes of Alcohol and Tobacco, are invited to patronize this house. The vegetable system will be strictly adhered to, but a table will be served for those who prefer a mixed diet. Croton shower and warm baths free.

October 17. ROSWELL GOSS.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

(Second Edition.)

JUST Published, and for sale at this office, a new work on Capital Punishment. By Charles Spear. It contains a variety of thrilling and instructive anecdotes; also, all the capital offenses in every State in the Union; and a speech from O'Connell on the subject. Also, several instances of the execution of the *innocent*. Facts are drawn from history and observation, and the entire scripture ground has been examined. The work is embellished with a fine engraving. Price, 62 1-2 cents.

Education and Industry!

THE Northampton Association of Education and Industry have appropriated a suitable tenement for the accommodation of 15 or 20 boarding pupils. They will be members of a family, under the care of the Director of Education, assisted by his wife, and other teachers, and will be subject to the same treatment and regulations as pupils who are members of the association. The name of the association indicates the idea of culture, towards the realization of which our efforts will be directed. Systematic, habitual industry is deemed indispensable to education, which should aim at the harmonious development of the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious tendencies in active, practical life.

We shall consider $100 a year as an equivalent for instruction and board; from which a suitable deduction will be made when a pupil comes for several years. The year will commence on the 1st of May, next, and will have no fixed and entire vacation. Pupils will be received for a year at any time.

O. MACK, *Director of Education.*

BROUGHTON MEADOWS,
Northampton, April 14, 1844.

FREE CALICOES!

JUST received, 1 case fine calicoes. Also, 2 cases fine shirting muslins; together with a large assortmen of other free dry goods, at reduced prices, wholesale and retail. CHARLES WISE,

Northwest corner Arch and Fifth streets.
Philadelphia, 8th, mo. 17th 1843. tf.

PHILADELPHIA ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE.

No. 31, *North Fifth street.*

The National Anti-Slavery Standard, will be issued regularly from this office, on Thursday of every week.

TERMS—the same as in New-York; i. e. $2,00 a year if paid in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months. $10,00, in advance, will pay for six copies for one year, sent to one